FULBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

SEPTEMBER 1948 PRICE 1s. 3d. NET.

The Expository Times

FOUNDED IN 1889 BY
JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

EDITORS
A. W. HASTINGS, M.A.
Rev. E. HASTINGS, M.A.

Contents

PAGE

I. NOTES OF RECENT EXPOSITION—Crisis—The Barthian Movement—The Bishop of Chichester and Christian Unity—The Roman Catholic Doctrine of the Virgin Mary . 309

II. PREACHING AND THEOLOGY IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY AND TO-DAY. By the Reverend Ian A. Muirhead, B.D., Forfar 312

III. THE DATES IN 'EZEKIEL.' By the Reverend Norman H. Snaith, D.D., Wesley College, Leeds 315

IV. LITERATURE 317

V. UNSOLVED NEW TESTAMENT PROBLEMS: GOODSPEED'S THEORY REGARDING THE ORIGIN OF EPHESIANS. By the Reverend C. Leslie Mitton, B.A., M.Th., Nottingham 323

VI. IN THE STUDY—
1. Virginibus Puerisque 327
2. The Christian Year 328

VII. RECENT FOREIGN THEOLOGY. By Professor H. H. Rowley, D.D., Manchester . 334

VIII. ENTRE NOUS—Alexander Stewart, Prisoner of Napoleon and Preacher of the Gospel . . 336

IX. TITLE PAGE AND CONTENTS TO VOLUME THE FIFTY-NINTH

VOLUME LIX. No. 12

38 GEORGE ST. : T. & T. CLARK : EDINBURGH
EDITORIAL AND ADVERTISING OFFICES, KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN

The Expository Times

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS

This month's issue completes Volume LIX. Binding Case for this Volume will be ready later. *Price* 2/6 (*Postage* 4d.).

Subscribers who cannot get their copies cased locally may send them to us for attention.

Subscriptions for Volume LX, which begins with the October Number, should now be sent in. The rate is 16/6 (*Postage included*).

"Many preachers and teachers acknowledge great obligations to the magazine. It has suggested new lines of thought for tired preachers and has provided rich material for addresses and sermons . . . *The Expository Times* retains the qualities which have made it almost indispensable to a well-informed ministry"—*Baptist Times.*

38 GEORGE ST.
EDINBURGH, 2

T. & T. CLARK

POSTAL TUITION

FOR THE LONDON UNIVERSITY

B.D.

& M.Th. DEGREES; DIPLOMA IN THEOLOGY

London University degree examinations are open to all. University residence is unnecessary. Candidates may read at home; those over 23 may take the shorter Special Entrance, instead of the Matriculation, Examination.

Many ministers have secured London B.A., B.D. & M.Th. degrees through entrusting their entire preparation to Wolsey Hall. In the hands of experienced and sympathetic graduate tutors studying for a Degree at home becomes a pleasure. Fees are moderate, and may be spread over the period of the Course. Moreover, should you be compelled to suspend or discontinue the Course, for *any* reason, *no* further instalments are payable beyond those due at the time. In the event of failure, tuition is continued *free of charge.*

HEBREW IS NOT NOW REQUIRED

for a Pass at London B.D.

Under the latest Regulations it is possible to obtain a *Pass* at London B.D. without offering Hebrew. To gain Honours, Candidates must still offer this subject

PROSPECTUS

and particulars of the new Regulations may be obtained post free and without incurring the least obligation from C. D. Parker, M.A., LL.D., Director of Studies, Dept. GE 44,

Wolsey Hall, Oxford

PROPRIETORS: DIPLOMA CORRESPONDENCE COLLEGE, LTD.

Distinctive Printing

WILL ALWAYS APPEAL!

We shall be pleased to submit suggestions for your **PRINTING** and **PUBLICITY REQUIREMENTS**

Write for particulars now to

MORRISON & GIBB Ltd.

PRINTERS • • BOOKBINDERS

TANFIELD, EDINBURGH

W. & A. K. JOHNSTON Ltd.

LITHOGRAPHERS • MAP PRINTERS

EDINA WORKS, EASTER ROAD, EDINBURGH

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE word 'crisis' is much beflogged in recent theology, and an instance of it is provided by Mr. Ulrich SIMON, Lecturer in Theology at King's College, London. In a newly published work of his—*Theology of Crisis*[1]—this word is to be found not only in the title but in almost every chapter-heading, and scores of times throughout the book. But the following sentences appearing on the 'jacket' explain the so frequent occurrence of the word, and at the same time convey a just impression of the book's contents.

'He sees the whole of human history as a series of crises on all levels of thought and experience, both secular and religious. He is particularly concerned with the idea of "Crisis" in religion, "the clash of the Creator and Creation, of transcendence and immanence"; and he traces the recurrence of this crisis in history, philosophy, Biblical Revelation and Christian Dogma, and demonstrates its presence in Christian Theology.'

In one of the chapters there is a sympathetic account of the Barthian Movement in Christian Theology. The author is, however, more in sympathy with the thought of Karl Barth himself than with that of Brunner, Gogarten, Bultmann, and the rest. He appears to regard Karl Barth as right in deprecating the idea that he is founding a 'school of theology' and that his theology might be named 'the theology of crisis.'

Remarking at the outset that, with the cataclysm of the First World War, crisis re-entered into the cosmic scheme without and apart from theology, he bids us note that theology might have had nothing new to say during and after that War had not Karl Barth, in the now famous observation of Keller's, 'rung the Church bell at night' with the publication of his commentary on Romans. Thereafter many Protestant theologians broke with the liberal tradition in so far as it assumed the gradual progress of the world. But the new contribution to theology that has ensued in the decades that have followed bears a misleading name when it is called 'the Theology of Crisis.' As if the concern of theology with crisis was a new thing!

The first general impression produced by the Barthian Movement is that of its uncompromising opposition to liberalism and to pagan naturalism. It is with an *a priori* dogmatics that these are opposed. Man is not the maker of theology, but theology sets man where he belongs, at the cross-roads, on the high ridge of decision.

'Gone are the days of an all-pervading system of reality, of an *analogia entis* and its teleological niceties and its dogmatic nuances. *Then* it was taken for granted that some existential, absolute objectivity not only existed but could be pursued as Truth, and also be reached, howbeit through trial and error; *now* there is, and remains God, unknown, hidden, revealed and revealing. God Transcendent who has spoken and who speaks, who can be known only through His Word in faith. The dialectic of religion is not, as hitherto assumed, one of the natural man coming to God, rationally, empirically, mystically, but it is that of *Wort-und-Antwort*; word-and-anti-word. The new theology of crisis is, therefore, not really concerned with a religion or with a truth, but with God and His Revelation in Jesus Christ.'

This first general impression of the so-called theology of crisis is well stated, and it leads to a second and more detailed impression. But here the author is not so successful, his statement often lacking clarity and precision. However, he succeeds in bringing out the point that in the Barthian Movement there is no mere restatement, as we are apt to think, of traditional Calvinism and Lutheranism. The language of the Protestant Reformers is carried forward no doubt, in particular the battle-cry *Sola fide*. But it should be observed that there is much rhetoric with these modern Protestant writers, and at times the word takes control of the pen. It is by no means easy to draw out the new element in Barthian theology.

[1] S.P.C.K.; 15s. net.

According to Barth, the theologian's task is to speak for and within the Church, through Word and Sacrament. In Word and Sacrament God breaks through the human solitude (*finitum non capax infiniti, peccator non capax verbi divini*). God speaks and commands; it is for man to listen and obey. There is no question of a capacity for religion or a genius for the mystical quest. Theology is of the Word of God, and the Word of God is the contemporaneous Christ who comes to break eternity into death-bound humanity, and man's life is thereafter eschatological; it is 'between the times' (*zwischen den Zeiten*).

In what sense, then, may we speak of a theology of crisis? The breaking of eternity into time is a critical event only because God has acted in thus speaking to man through Christ, setting him at the cross-roads, on the high ridge of decision. There is a theology of crisis only in the sense that God's action provokes a crisis, and it is the task of theology to describe this eternal provocation.

One of the ablest Anglican Bishops has written a book—*Christian Unity: The Anglican Position*[1]—on one of the most urgent of present-day problems. The Bishop is Dr. G. K. A. Bell of Chichester, and the problem is that of bringing the Christian churches together. His concern is to state the Anglican position, but the treatment goes much beyond that. His book, in fact, is offered as a contribution to the Re-union of Christendom, and he has his eye on both the eighth Lambeth Conference and the first Assembly of the World Council of Churches in Amsterdam.

Dr. Bell, like many Anglican authorities, makes a good deal of the mediating position of the Church of England. He quotes the Prayer Book: 'It hath been the wisdom of the Church of England ever since the first compiling of her public liturgy to keep the mean between the two extremes.' It is the combination of the Protestant and Catholic factors in the same body which gives the Church of England its peculiar quality and enables it to see both sides of the shield and to speak to both Catholic and Protestant Churches at the same time.

It ought to be stated at once that Dr. Bell regards the three orders of ministry, as found in the Anglican Church, as Apostolic. He is quite firm about this. He speaks of this as the Succession, and regards any Church outside this as not possessing the Divinely ordained order. At the same time he does not appear to deny to any Christian body which does possess all the other essentials, the Creed, the Sacraments, the Scriptures, the status of a Church, and quotes with approval the statement of Bishop Andrewes: 'nevertheless, if our Form [viz. Episcopacy] be of divine right it doth not follow from thence that there is no salvation without it, or that a church cannot consist without it.'

Dr. Bell takes up definitely the relation of Anglicanism to Rome. The Church of England has a special position in this matter because of the Catholic element in it. But the Bishop does not see any hope whatever of an accommodation with Rome. The Roman Church has shown a surprising concessiveness in matters of organisation but is adamant on dogmatic issues. The fundamental question at issue is: Is there, or is there not, a Vicar of Christ upon the earth who possesses *jure divino* a distinctive authoritative position in relation to the whole of Christendom? And Dr. Bell says plainly that one thing is clear. Dogmatic union between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, as they are to-day, is ruled entirely out of court.

The Bishop has a good deal to say about the Anglican relations with Episcopal churches on the Continent, with the American Episcopal Church and with the Orthodox Church. But most people will be much more interested in the Anglican attitude to non-Episcopal churches. Dr. Bell has a definite view of the way in which re-union should be approached. The plan of a single united British Church in which the various British denominations are absorbed is not, in his view, the way to the achievement of Church unity. Whatever may be the case with regard to an ultimate full organic union, the one hopeful way, at this stage of the proceedings, is to take the churches as they are, and to discover on what basis of agreement in faith and order, and by what processes any *one* of them may be brought into full fellowship and communion with the Church of England. And Dr. Bell adds: 'I see no probability of progress in Great Britain itself on the lines of an adaptation of the South India scheme.'

On two matters Dr. Bell finds definite advances. One is the permission to be given, 'in temporary circumstances and on special occasions,' to a non-Episcopalian to receive Holy Communion in an Episcopal church. The other matter is the interchange of preachers which is to be made possible on similar severely restricted occasions. It is unlikely that Christians in non-Episcopalian churches will regard these concessions with much

[1] Hodder and Stoughton; 6s. net.

gratitude or be startled by the largeness of the advance made toward re-union.

But this is by no means all Dr. BELL has to say on this line, and readers will turn to his closing pages with deep interest to find what his verdict is on 'Prospects for the Future.' At present, he says, 're-union' is commonly understood as meaning one of two things. It is fair to say that either what may be described as the Roman view, or what may be described as the Protestant view, holds the field. What leads the Anglican communion to seek a third way is the fact that neither of these views is wholly acceptable to it. Put succinctly, the outstanding factor is that as, on the one hand, Anglicans could not accept a scheme of re-union which meant submission to all the modern papal claims, so, on the other, they could not agree to a scheme which did not involve the extension of the Historic Episcopate to the whole Church.

Dr. BELL points out that a real unity exists in Christendom. 'The one visible Church still exists upon the earth, but it does not exist completely or exclusively in any one of its divided fragments. The unity is there but unrealised. What, then, is the focus point which shall serve as the instrument of the visible unity? The answer is: 'The College of Bishops.' With all its faults, with all its declensions from the primitive purity, the Episcopate has always retained its inherent awareness of itself as the ideal embodiment of unity, and, in practice, has been by far the most effective bond of actual union throughout the whole Church. The unity of the Church is found in the unity of the Episcopate.

One of the merits of Bishop BELL's book is that it makes clear what the Episcopate is to the Anglican Church. Here is Bishop Stubb's verdict, approved by the author, describing the Historic Episcopate 'not merely as a method of Church government, in which sense it could hardly be called historic, but as a distinct, substantive and historic transmission of the commission of the Apostles in and by which our Lord formed His disciples into a distinct organised body or Church. The Historic Episcopate is of the very essence of the Church of England and could not be suffered to be called in question by any body or individual desirous to be incorporated in our Communion.'

It is of the utmost importance that all who are interested in the question of re-union and who belong to non-Episcopalian churches should grasp the fact stated in the previous paragraph. If the Episcopate is of the very essence of the Anglican Church and not merely an instrument of church government, it is perfectly plain why there can be no compromise on this point with other churches. It is as plain why the Church of England could not recognise, for example, the Presbyters of the Church of Scotland as of 'equal standing' and validity. The attitude of the Anglican Church over against all non-Episcopalian churches is this: re-union must come 'through a giving and receiving Episcopacy.' That is both clear and final. And that is Bishop BELL's position in this book which is given to us as a contribution to re-union. It is not within the purpose of these particular pages to criticize. They are meant for exposition not criticism. But we may say how readily those of all the churches welcome any such contribution as we find in this book from one who is not only extremely able but at the same time broad-minded and independent.

A 'meditative study' of the life of Christ, expository rather than apologetical in character, has come from the pen of Dom Aelred GRAHAM, O.S.B., S.T.L., Professor of Dogmatic Theology at Ampleforth Abbey, York—*The Christ of Catholicism*.[1] While the author wholeheartedly accepts the dogmatic teaching of the Roman Church, and the witness of the early Fathers, he shows appreciation of such modern religious thinkers as Kierkegaard, Emil Brunner, and William Temple.

Much of the book is common ground with other Christian writers of conservative mind, whether Catholic or Protestant, but we should like to call attention to the section on the Rôle of the Mother of God, in which the Roman doctrine concerning the Virgin Mary is carefully set forth. It is a doctrine which Protestants, and even Catholics, do not readily understand, and there is a good deal of popular confusion as to the meaning, in particular, of the Immaculate Conception. A brief summary of the section should be helpful.

God need not have chosen Mary to be the Mother of the Saviour. But this in fact was what He did. She was chosen from among all women to provide a human body for the incarnate Word. It was hardly to be thought of, however, that He would allow her who was to be so highly privileged to inherit the guilt of original sin. How was that prevented? It was through her receiving a unique redemption.

'For the rest of us Christ's redemptive sacrifice was an act of reparation for, and liberation from,

[1] Longmans; 21s. net.

sin ; for our Lady it was a complete preservation from it. Such is the Immaculate Conception. At the moment of her soul's infusion into her body, when, by the laws of a nature vitiated through Adam's sin she should have contracted its guilt, God exempted her from it—in view of the foreseen merits of His Son, and hers.'

The section goes on to consider the unique prerogatives of Mary, as standing closer to God than any of the angels or saints, and as freed from the initial clouding of the mind and feebleness of will which are the results of the transmission of Adam's sin. 'She comes before us, God's masterpiece, of all pure creatures the fairest, the noblest and the best.'

Then we have a picture of the boyhood years at Nazareth, in which Jesus is represented according to the Roman Catholic tradition as allowing Mary the rights of a mother over her child, yet at the same time as sanctifying the souls of Mary and Joseph and, above all, preparing Mary for the part she was to play in His redeeming mission. Support is found for this in the story of the loss and finding of the boy Jesus when He was twelve years old, and also in the extreme reticence, even austerity, which marks the attitude of Jesus to Mary throughout the public ministry. Her part, it should be explained, is that of our Co-redemptrix, the offering of our Great High Priest being accompanied from the first moment of the Incarnation to the last scene at Calvary by her surrender of Him to God.

'Mary is Co-redemptrix, not in the order of achievement as having paid our ransom, but in the order of application as interceding with God that the benefits of the Redemption may be bestowed upon us. She reigns now in heaven, as Pius XII. teaches, to make intercession with her Son, "so that from that august Head abundance of grace may flow in a steady stream into all the members of his mystical Body." '

There is much more in the section concerning the Rôle of the Mother of God, on which Pius XII., among recent Popes, has made pronouncements by way of exposition or amplification, but from what we have put before our readers a true impression may be gathered as to the place assigned to the Virgin Mary in Roman dogmatics, and more particularly as to the meaning of the dogma (a comparatively recent one) of the Immaculate Conception.

It is a dogma that appears deeply to impress the minds of Roman Catholic theologians. Here in this volume it is affirmed, for example, that the preservative redemption involved in the Immaculate Conception is the outstanding proof of the uniqueness of Christ's love for His Mother. The ordinary Protestant theologian would find it difficult to think of Christ as doing anything a certain number of years before the Incarnation for her through whom He was to become incarnate.

Even in the Middle Ages the idea of immaculate conception was subject to the criticism that, if one immaculate conception is to be assumed, why not a whole series ? And in our age a doctrine that is bound up with the Patristic dogma of the transmission of the guilt of Adam's sin rests upon an insecure foundation.

None the less the Roman doctrine concerning the Virgin Mary, while containing elements of confusion and difficulty for Catholic no less than Protestant piety, need not be the cause of offence to the Protestant mind that it often is ; at any rate the volume under review should dispel some misunderstandings.

Preaching and Theology in the Thirteenth Century and To-day.

By the Reverend Ian A. Muirhead, B.D., Forfar.

The thirteenth century is in many ways the most striking period of the Middle Ages. It began with Innocent III. occupying the papal throne ; it included, as it proceeded, the life work of Francis and Dominic, of Aquinas and Bonaventura, of Raymond Lully and of Roger Bacon ; when it ended, Dante was thirty-five years of age. It was the century of the Universities, of the Mendicant Orders, and of the high levels of mediæval theology.

At first sight it seems such a century can have little in common with our own, yet, on two fundamental issues, Christianity was faced with very similar problems. For one thing the Christian

faith was confronted with a mass of new knowledge which challenged the existing forms in which it was stated. Then again there was a drift from the Christian faith which the existing machinery of the Church seemed powerless to halt.

Until about the middle of the previous century Aristotle was an unknown quantity. Few thought of reading Greek and few had access to the works of the sage. It was into the hands of Arabic translators and commentators that the Greek tradition passed, and it was through contact with them and with their work in Southern Italy, in Sicily, and particularly in Spain, that Aristotle was brought to the knowledge of the West. The effect was immediate and grew universal. No one escaped the influence of Aristotle, and the problem facing the Church was that of new ways and subjects of thought not only unassimilated to, but capable of being interpreted in direct conflict with the tenets of orthodoxy.

Secondly, and not unconnected with the foregoing, was the increasing drift from the faith. It was at its worst in the South of France. Here a prosperous and luxurious society, a corrupt and impotent Church, and the infiltration of heretical views of a pronounced oriental cast over a long period, made an ideal environment for indifference, materialism, and militant heresy.

The seriousness of the situation had produced counter-measures, even in the previous century, but repeated efforts planned or made had failed to do much to improve matters. When Innocent III. became Pope energetic measures against heresy were among his first concerns. The Abbot of Cîteaux was given extensive powers to cleanse the Church life of the badly affected areas, and these he proceeded to use. On the side of the civil authorities, Peter of Castelnau was given the task of enlisting and organizing the active support of the nobles against the heretics in their lands. Of these nobles, the most powerful, and the most difficult to enlist on the side of orthodoxy, was the Count of Toulouse. Feeling rose, and when Peter, having excommunicated Raymond of Toulouse, was himself murdered, the Pope turned to more drastic measures, to the proclamation of a Crusade against the heretics.

Meanwhile there had appeared on the scene two new forces, ultimately of far greater influence on the life of the Church than the Pope's anti-heretical crusade. In Italy and in Spain, in different and contrasted environments, two young men were being moulded for the parts they were to play in what one of them saw as ' the rebuilding of Christ's Church.'

Francis, the rich man's son, called from a gay life to wed poverty and to build up the ruined Church, was attracting to himself a small group of companions fired by his enthusiasm. In his own mind, the dominant thought was that of the uniqueness of what he was doing. ' The Lord would fain have one new small people, unique in itself and different from all that have gone before.' The first Papal sanction which the new order received was merely the verbal permission to preach repentance to the people, but to its founder and his immediate circle, this was secondary to their main purpose, in poverty and humility to follow as exactly as possible the Lord Jesus Christ. Preaching was therefore not central for the Franciscans at the start.

It was otherwise with the Dominicans. Dominic was already a cathedral Canon when his interest in the lapsed and heretical became a positive call to his life work. He conceived of his Order as being a counter-offensive to the vigorous and virulent heresies of Southern France, and from the start his conviction was that preaching, and the saving of men through preaching, was the most urgent necessity of the day.

Dominic and his preachers had an early friend in Fulk, the energetic and reforming Bishop of Toulouse, and by him they were confirmed as ' preachers in order to extirpate heresy, wrestle against vice, teach the rule of faith, and diffuse good manners.' The year was 1215, and in October, Dominic and his friend the Bishop proceeded to Rome to seek Innocent's support.

The Lateran Council had decreed that bishops should appoint specially qualified men to preach in their dioceses, but Dominic's proposals were only after some hesitation approved. Tradition ascribes to Innocent's successor the bestowal of the name of Friars Preachers by which the Order became known.

It is clear then that corrupt as the Church was in many of her clergy, she was still alive and able to respond creatively to new situations. The two orders of Friars, followed by the Augustinians and Carmelites, represented something new in her life, a fresh response to a new situation. Often opposed and at variance, the interaction between the Franciscans and Dominicans was constantly going on. The Dominicans were preachers, the Franciscans were married to poverty, but soon the Dominicans, although as a matter of policy rather than conviction, had adopted poverty, and the Franciscans had become great preachers. Preaching became the outstanding characteristic of both Orders, and few notable preachers of the thirteenth century did not belong to one or the other.

From the start the Friars tended to be drawn toward the cities and particularly toward the University cities. Force of circumstances and good generalship combined in this, for what the man in

the street was thinking was only a reflection of the thought of the schools. Only fourteen universities in Europe appear to have been in existence prior to the thirteenth century, but their size and numbers constantly increased. In them men were wrestling with the new learning as it filtered first through the Arab commentators, then directly in translations from the Greek. For the Friars, the Universities, where this ferment of thought was taking place, were of first importance. Thus, first the Dominicans, then the Franciscans became established at Paris in the years 1217–20. The Dominicans were established at Bologna in 1217, and on their arrival in England in 1221, it is significant that Oxford was one of their first objectives. They were joined there by the Franciscans in 1224.

No doubt the primary motive in this was to reach the students. It was related of Fr. Jordan of Saxony that he always liked to spend time in places where there were students, in the hope of winning them into the Order. Very soon, however, there was another motive. In both Orders, and particularly among the Franciscans, voices were raised in protest, for learning might well prove a snare and a temptation, distracting them from their true calling; but this was not the view which finally prevailed. With the Dominicans, then gradually among the other Friars, it came to be held that there could be no preaching without study. 'Study is not the end of the Order,' wrote the Dominican, Humbert de Romans, 'but it is exceedingly necessary to secure its twofold end, namely preaching and the salvation of souls, for without study, neither can be achieved.' [1]

Within ten years of their arrival in Paris the Dominicans had a Chair in the Faculty of Theology, and, two years later, when the Franciscans also received a Chair in Theology, the Dominicans received their second.[2] An Englishman, John of St. Giles, who had been a master before he took the Dominican habit, was one of the first teachers in theology.

This was not accomplished without opposition, both at Oxford and at Paris, where, in 1229, it produced a strike of masters, but, while jealousy and dissension might continue, by the middle of the century, the position of the Mendicants in the Universities was secure. They used their new opportunities to considerable purpose. Among the Franciscans were such thinkers as Alexander of Hales, Bonaventura, and at the end of the century, Duns Scotus; among the Dominicans were Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas; and in both Orders there was a great company of less famous teachers.

The movement from the pulpit to the professorship was highly important, not merely for its consequences on the Orders themselves, but in the profound effect which it had on the course of mediæval philosophy. In the view of Professor Gilson, the history of thought in the hundred years we are considering is the history of the influence of Aristotle. In the assimilation of Aristotle into Western thought a decisive part was played by the friars.[3] Each of the Orders had its characteristic attitude—one could be said to choose one's philosophy the day one chose one's habit. The Franciscans looked back toward Augustine, but, in for example the thought of Bonaventura, the Augustinianism had come perforce to terms with Aristotle. More thoroughgoing, and more lasting in its effects was the Dominican attitude. This accepted and reinterpreted for itself the conclusions of Aristotelianism, until it had produced from it the answer to the heresies which it had itself originally begotten.

Only gradually, in fact a book at a time, was the new learning set free from papal ban. We must realize, however easy it is to forget it now, that the philosophers and theologians of the Mendicant Orders were in their own day innovators, and on occasion daring innovators, as they took the new learning and built it into the system of their own thought.

In this, and in their constant preoccupation alongside this with the work of preaching, they provided the answer of the Church of this century to her two pressing problems, and in doing so they demonstrated a permanent truth for the Christian faith. They set out to be poor preachers, and finished in University Chairs. They set out to win men by preaching, and finished by adding some of its greatest names to the history of human thought. The earliest and best conviction of the Friars was that preaching is the answer to heresy and irreligion; experience taught them a further truth, that the preacher needs the theologian. So they provided in their own age the demonstration of what is a truth for all ages, that preaching cannot ultimately live without theology.

[1] Humbert de Romans, quoted in Bede Jarrett, *The English Dominicans*, 44.

[2] De Wulf, *History of Mediæval Philosophy*, ii. 15.

[3] Étienne Gilson, *La Philosophie au Moyen Age*, 118, 124.

The Dates in 'Ezekiel.'

By the Reverend Norman H. Snaith, D.D., Wesley College, Leeds.

It is customary to assume that all the dates given in the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel are to be reckoned from the year 597 B.C., the year of the first deportation of the Jews to Babylonia. That two of them are intended so to be reckoned is clear, since it is expressly so stated, 'in the twelfth (five-and-twentieth) year of our captivity' (33^{21} 40^{1}). There is further support for this in 1^{2}, where the phrase of the previous verse 'in the fifth of the month' is explained as meaning 'in the fifth year of the exile of king Jehoiachin.' The actual form of this second verse raises suspicions as to its genuineness. The repetition of the word or phrase on which comment is to be made is a custom made familiar by the Talmud, and by the commentators generally; cf. Rashi, Norzi, etc. Further, the form of the comment itself can be paralleled in the Old Testament itself in 1 K $6^{1.\ 38}$ 8^{2} and elsewhere, or by a similar use of the pronoun זה in Ps 68^{9}. Our conclusion, therefore, is that some editor or scribe held that the date in 1^{1} really meant the year 593 B.C., so he took advantage of the occurrence of the word בחמשה (in the fifth), and said (implicitly) that it did not mean the fifth of the month at all, as it said, and (explicitly) that it did mean the fifth year. Has this editor been at work elsewhere in the book?

Hölscher (*Hezekiel*, 108, 125 f., 147) held that all the dates were due to a late redactor, whilst Hitzig long ago [1847] had rejected them all as being untrustworthy. Torrey (*Pseudo-Ezekiel*, 59) regarded them as being due to a late interpolator, who gave the book the form in which we have it. It seems better to assume, on the basis of 1^{1} and its interpolated explanation in the following verse, that there are two opinions embodied in the text itself as to the way in which the dates should be reckoned. One is represented by 1^{1} and is the earlier system, and the other is a later interpretation, represented by 1^{2} and presumably by (at least) 33^{21} and 40^{1}. Cooke (*Ezekiel*, p. xix.) thinks that all the dates are genuine. He does not include that in 1^{2}, but 33^{21} and 40^{1} evidently belong to the same tradition.

The best approach to the solution of the problem is to begin with 'the thirtieth year' of 1^{1}. The oldest explanation is that of the Targum and Jerome, that it is the thirtieth year from 621 B.C., the year of the discovery of the Law-book in the Temple, *i.e.* the eighteenth year of the reign of King Josiah (2 K $22^{3.\ 8}$). This has been supported in modern times by Hermann, who thought it natural that the finding of the nucleus of the Deuteronomic Law should be a datum-line in later years, when the Law was established as the rule and norm of Jewry. Ḳimḥi says, in his commentary, that his father Joseph explained the thirtieth as referring to the year of a jubilee period, but this is a speculation without foundation.

Generally speaking, the attempts at solution have involved attempts to make the thirtieth of 1^{1} fit in with the fifth of 1^{2}. So we get Duhm (*Jeremia*, 202) suggesting that the original reading in 1^{1} was 'fifth' He was followed by Marti, Bertholet [1897 Commentary], and Hölscher [1924], the suggestion being that the alteration to 'thirtieth' was made deliberately by a scribe to make Ezekiel's forty years (4^{6}) fit in with Jeremiah's seventy (25^{11}), the thirtieth year of the Exile being the year in which Ezekiel received his call. Rothstein, too, secures the date 593 B.C., by changing 'thirtieth' to thirteenth,' and reckoning it as the thirteenth year of Nebuchadrezzar's reign. He has support for such a system of reckoning in Jer $52^{29.\ 30}$. Or again, the emendation to 'thirteenth' having once been suggested, might it not mean the thirteenth year 'of our captivity,' *i.e.* the thirteenth year from 597, and so 585 B.C.? This is the date adopted by Sellin (*Geschichte*, 1932) and Bertholet [1936 Commentary]. There is a great deal to be said for this date. It has, at any rate, the merit of abandoning the attempt to make the date of 1^{1} (which may actually be correct after all) fit in with the clearly spurious date in 1^{2}.

Another modern solution is the revival of an ancient suggestion by Origen, that it means the thirtieth year of the prophet's age. So Cornill [1886], Kraetzschmar [1900], Budde [1900], and Herntrich [1932]. This suggestion is embodied by Bewer in *Kittel*[3], where he adopts Budde's emendations, שֵׁנִי or לְחַיֵּי (The Expository Times, xii. 39; *American Journal of Biblical Literature*, i. 20 ff.). Other emendations with a similar purpose in view have been proposed by Eichhorn, Guthe, and Kraetzschmar.

The solution proposed in this article is that ch. 1 must certainly be fixed soon after the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C., and the destruction of the Temple. Sellin and Bertholet are certainly right. When else would God leave His Temple at Jerusalem except when it was desecrated and destroyed? His throne could not possibly be the fixed and immovable seat of Is 6^{1}. It has wheels

and wings, and the wheels are 'wheels within wheels,' the inner one at right angles to the outer one, so that it can travel east and west, or north and south, and wheels so that neither mountain nor valley can impede it. God leaves His Temple only with the greatest reluctance. He rises up from the cherub and tarries over the threshold (Ezk 10^4). Next He halts at the east gate of the Lord's house (10^{19}); then on the Mount of Olives, 'the mountain which is on the east side of the city' (11^{23}), till finally He rests by the river Chebar ($10^{21.}$ 1). If God's people can no longer come to Him to His ancient House, too far away now and in any case destroyed, then God can come to them. We take, then, the date of this vision to be 585 B.C., the vision which Ezekiel saw after he had arrived in Babylon amongst the 586 exiles.

But what is the datum-line from which the thirtieth year is to be reckoned? The answer must be 615 B.C., and this was the year of King Jehoiachin's birth. If he was eighteen in 597 B.C., as is stated in 2 K 24^1, then 585 B.C. is indeed his thirtieth year. This is certainly an unusual sort of way by which to fix a date, but there is at least as much to be said for it as for fixing it by the year of the prophet's age. There is evidence that both Jeremiah and Ezekiel saw the righteous Remnant in Jehoiachin and his band of 597 exiles (Jer $24^{2\text{-}10}$, Ezk 11^{19} 37 $17^{22f.}$). Further, the Books of the Kings close with Jehoiachin's exaltation in exile above the other heathen kings, so that the final editor of that history evidently believed that in some sense the promised glories would be realised in him.

Whether this explanation is adequate or not, there is something to be said for keeping 615 B.C. as the datum-line. Consider, for instance, the Egyptian oracles. These are dated at the end of the tenth year (29^1; LXX has twelfth), the tenth month, to be precise; and the eleventh year (30^{20} first month, and 31^1 third month). These three dates now all belong to the year 604, and are thus brought into close connexion with the Battle of Carchemish, that battle which marked the end of Pharaoh-necho and of Egypt's hope for world power. The other Egyptian oracles belong to the same period, but a year or so later, namely toward the end of the twelfth year (32^1 and 32^{17}).

There are two dates which are connected with serious apostasy in Jerusalem. They are 8^1 (sixth year, sixth or fifth month) and 20^1 (seventh year, fifth month). It is customary for these to be taken to belong to the period between 597 B.C. and 586 B.C., *i.e.* after 'the good figs' had gone and only 'the bad figs' remained. But if we take 615 B.C. as the datum-line, then the sixth year, sixth month is March 608 (counting in pre-exilic fashion) and the seventh year, fifth month is February 607. These dates are close up to the untimely death of King Josiah, that untoward event which involved the complete collapse of the religious reformation and the return to all the cults of Canaan.

We are left with the dates connected with the oracles against Tyre (24^1 [ninth year, tenth month], 26^1 [eleventh year, ? month], and 29^{17} [twenty-seventh year, first month]). The first of these two dates is the date on which Nebuchadrezzar began his attack on Jerusalem, and the year is 588 B.C. It is counted from the year 597 B.C. The second date is (probably) toward the end of 586 B.C., once again dated from 597 B.C. The third date is in a small supplement, added to explain how it was that the two other prophecies were not fulfilled, Nebuchadrezzar having raised the siege of Tyre in 573—the actual date of the oracle is 570 B.C. These three (properly two with a correction) refer to the fall of the city. This is true also of the date in 33^{21}, where it is expressly stated that the datum-line is 597 B.C. All the dates, therefore, which refer to the fall of the city are counted from 597 B.C. The only date given in the last nine chapters, that in 40^1, is fixed doubly, both from 597 B.C. and from 586 B.C. It opens the section which deals with the building up of what was destroyed in 586 B.C. The date is 572 B.C. The last nine chapters thus belong to the same date system as the interpolation of 1^2. All other dates are counted from 615 B.C.

We are still seeking a solution of the problems of this complicated book. If the suggestions made in this article are sound, then we must allow the call of Ezekiel to be as early as 608 B.C., it being thus connected with the sudden revulsion to apostasy which took place immediately at the death of King Josiah. This might explain the extreme vigour of his denunciation of the cults of Canaan. Further, are we to assume that the second system of dating is by another author, one who wrote after 586 B.C., and was in Palestine? This would deny the Tyre oracles to Ezekiel.

Literature.

THE PARISH IN HISTORY.

Parish and Parish Church: Their Place and Influence in History. Being the Baird Lecture for 1935, by the Very Rev. P. D. Thomson, D.D. (Nelson; 12s. 6d. net).

'The influence of the Christian congregation upon history, the contribution of the parish to the world,' wrote Sir George Adam Smith in 1904, 'is a subject which is waiting for a historian.' These words of his great teacher have never been far from Dr. Thomson's thoughts during thirty years of a busy ministry, and they are the seed from which this remarkable book has come. No doubt sporadic efforts have been made to deal with one or other aspect of the theme, but Dr. Thomson is probably right in saying that no essay has been made to explore the field as a whole, to trace the growth of the parish system from its inception early in the Christian era to its final establishment throughout Christendom, or, hardest task of all, to attempt a survey of the place of parish and parish church and their influence in history. This is what Dr. Thomson has done in his Baird Lecture. I have found this a completely absorbing and fascinating book, full of real scholarship, and written in an easy and attractive style, and, as the development of the parish as a religious and then civil unit, with its broad, varied human activities, is traced, every chapter in the story increasing and sustaining its human interest, I confess I have found it difficult to lay the book down.

The parish had its origin in the pre-Christian Roman and Greek world. It existed as a civil administration in two forms. In and around the cities were gathered two different kinds of community. One was within the bounds, but its inhabitants were not citizens in the full sense. They were foreigners or sojourners. The other was without the bounds, 'uitlanders,' living in the country, a rural population, strictly suburban and devoid of civil rights. Both were included in the *parochia*. It is probably in view of this state of things that St. Paul, writing to the Ephesians, says: 'Ye are no more strangers and foreigners but fellow-citizens with the saints,' without civil privileges but full members of the Kingdom of God. It was to these people the gospel of the Church was directed at first, and the *parochia* became the unit of the Christian mission. From this primitive institution Dr. Thomson takes his start, and shows how the religious parish became the mother of many developments. It never quite lost its civil character, and as time went on it entered more and more into the whole range of secular life. One of the most delightful things in Dr. Thomson's survey is the way in which he takes one aspect of life after another and traces its growth within the parish bounds and its contribution to the wider life of the world. Thus we have education, music, literature, architecture in different chapters surveyed as fruits of Christian inspiration and parish activities.

Dr. Thomson believes that the Church of to-day should develop its mission on parochial lines. But he is alive to the fact which makes this difficult. The growth of large cities has almost obliterated the parish. The parish church is no longer the church of many people living within its bounds. That is the fact which makes the territorial system so difficult to work. Dr. Thomson is emphatically in favour of retaining this system. But he points out that the parish is not a rigid but a flexible conception, not stereotyped as to size or church agencies. And he suggests as some solution of the difficulty (1) the grouping of parishes into a 'common parish,' with a close co-operation of its churches in services and work, (2) the formation of church councils in towns of under fifty thousand people, with representatives from each church, and (3) the appointment of teams of ministers, each having his own distinctive office and function. How far these proposals are relevant, and how far they are practicable are matters for discussion, but it is both interesting and valuable to have any intelligent policy stated and expounded.

I have already said how whole-heartedly I admire this scholarly contribution to an important subject. May I invite the author to re-consider his statements on the origin of the Christian ministry? 'As in the New Testament, so in the Church of the early centuries,' he writes, 'the three orders of Christian ministry were those of bishop, presbyter and deacon . . . each original Church as it was founded had its bishop and its due complement of presbyters and deacons . . . every original Church, then, had its body of presbyters with its bishop as *primus inter pares*.' But is it not clear that there were only *two* orders of minister in the New Testament Church? St. Paul, we read in Acts, sent for the elders of the Church at Ephesus and addressing them said: 'Take care of the Church of God over which He has made you bishops.' Does not this mean that the rulers of the Church were presbyters, sometimes called from their function 'bishops'? In writing to the Philippians he sends a message to the 'bishops and deacons,' office-bearers in one congregation. And in the Pastorals the chief office-bearers of the Church are called in one letter bishops and in another presbyters. However, this is a controversial note and does not obscure the interest and value of a very noteworthy book, which will rejoice all who appreciate sound scholarship, and is an honour to the Church Dr. Thomson represents.

F. J. Rae.

ISLAM AND CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY.

When he was Vice-Principal of the Henry Martyn School of Islamics at Aligarh, Mr. Windrow Sweetman, distressed by the discovery of how

dense was the ignorance of each other's faith shown by both Christians and Muhammadans, made the heroic resolve to issue, on a grand scale, a comparative study of the authentic teaching and belief of the two religions, taking account of the various sects and Schools of thought in each, and of their influence upon one another.

It was a colossal task to undertake. Yet two years ago the first volume of his daring enterprise appeared. And, now that he has been appointed to the Chair of Islamics at Selly Oak, he has not turned aside from it. For here is the second volume, dealing with the early formative period of Muhammadan doctrine and thought—*Islam and Christian Theology*, Part I. Vol. 2 (Lutterworth Press; 18s. net).

It is safe to say that in the whole round world only a mere handful are competent to produce such a study; possessing the required width of exact and detailed knowledge of both Christian and Muslim literature and theology; and, almost, if not quite, as important, the balance and steadiness of judgment that Mr. Sweetman shows. He faces and carries through his task with no visible sense of strain. Deftly and steadily he finds his way among the welter of conflicting Schools continually acting and reacting on each other, and the mass of competing doctrines and interpretations; fortifying himself at every step with apt quotations from both sides, indeed all sides; many of them, especially the Muslim ones, taken from first-hand sources, hopelessly out of reach of the most of us. This is a really learned and very able work, compact with knowledge cleverly summarized.

And what do we find? First, as to the Standards. The Qur'an is declared to be the eternal and uncreated Word of God, identified with the Prototype in Heaven; but it is not claimed to be all of it. Rather 'there is one transcendent Word, with various revelations of it to mankind.' Hence in the Qur'an one hundred and thirty-one passages which refer to the Bible—to the Law, to the Psalms, to the Gospels, often with the highest praise.

Here, too, critical questions emerge and worry. Is the primitive text correctly preserved? and the like. Above all, there is the difficulty of the abrogations. In Scripture there is a gradual growing revelation from less to more, culminating in the Teaching and Character of Christ, by which all that went before is now tested; and as it meets, or does not meet, that supreme standard, stands or falls. But there are sixty-three Suras which are withdrawn or corrected in the Qur'an itself, yet remain in the text; raising ugly questions about the finality of the heavenly prototype, or of the faithfulness of the Qur'an's reproduction of it. And then there is Tradition, regarded as 'revelation almost co-ordinate in authority with the Qur'an,' much in the Roman Catholic fashion.

And what of the God of Islam? Certain Schools of thought, the Sufis and the other mystics, exult in His immanence most arrestingly. But the orthodox Muslim, with a Brahmanic terror of contaminating Him with matter, or of 'degrading Him into an idol with human qualities and failings,' has isolated Him; some sects indulging in 'an orgy of negation' that even Pseudo-Dionysius cannot out-top. The Allah of the Qur'an, constantly called the Compassionate, the Merciful, the Forgiving, becomes remote, and, indescribable, indeed really unknowable. Hence interesting pages on the Qur'anic teaching upon His forgiveness and grace; what these mean and are. For few attain to Al Ghazzali's insight into the Divine love.

Further, though so fiercely monotheistic, 'triadic schemes are not unknown in Islam'; and if the Incarnation is denied, 'Something has had to be devised to take its place.' And with that we are led out by a sure-footed guide into fields little trodden, though well worth visiting.

And so to an impressive handling of Predestination. In Islam there are resolute upholders of free will, such as the Qadarites. But the orthodox are thus described in the final summing up of a full discussion, 'The problem may never be solved, but any doctrine should preserve the justice and wisdom of God, and the responsibility of man. Even if Christianity has not settled the problem and must alternately think of the Divine Lordship and the freedom of men, so that Calvinists preach like Methodists and Methodists pray like Calvinists, nevertheless there is a healthy tension in Christian thought, which in Islam has long ceased, the equilibrium lost and over-balanced in favour of an unrelieved determinism.'

So to the doctrine of Man, starting out from the assertion that 'Muslim theology never seems to have realized the necessity of such a doctrine'; and sin. 'The Old Testament emphasizes throughout the idea that sin is against God, whereas in the Qur'an the emphasis is on the injury that a man does to himself when he sins.' And so, in turn, to a consideration of such matters as salvation—what it is and how it is attained, of faith and works; and, finally, a solemnizing consideration of the last things—in all some two hundred and fifty pages crowded with matter, together with some valuable appendices and indices of all kinds. This is, indeed, an interesting journey.

A. J. Gossip.

NEW FORMS OF THE OLD FAITH.

Amongst Baird Lecturers the Rev. James Black, D.D., must surely be unique. There is a lightness of touch about *New Forms of the Old Faith*, the Baird Lecture, 1946–47 (Nelson; 12s. 6d. net), which would perhaps have startled some of the more solemn members of the erudite succession in the Lectureship, and caused them to shake their heads in slight consternation before relaxing in an inevitable smile of approval. But perhaps few of his predecessors could have held the attention of both learned and unlearned readers from the first page to the last so easily as Dr. Black has done. He has chosen very varied and confused themes, and the title of his book is significant both of his purpose and his point of view. He is out to capture the interest not so

much of the theologian as of the layman in these matters—of those who do not wish to deal with these 'Extra-Church Systems' by prolonged scholarly investigations, but who are being constantly perplexed and practically embarrassed by the extravagances of many modern religious movements, and disturbed by the specious attractiveness of the arguments brought forward in their defence. To the aid of those thus troubled in heart comes Dr. Black, not sitting rigidly in judgment but seeking to discern elements of genuine religious value amidst the often bizarre meanderings of speculation. In some cases, however, he is so disturbed by what he describes as 'the stupendous credulity of many simple people who will believe anything if only it is sufficiently asserted,' that in this criticism he is constrained to cry aloud and spare not, and his conclusions are then so devastating and adverse that one wonders how the 'new form' he is dealing with can at all be brought within the 'old faith.' Occasionally, also, in his justifiable vehemence, he gets a little weary of a severely logical form of argument, and there is a slight suspicion of over-simplification and question-begging in the short cut he takes to his conclusion. In dealing with an opponent of a currently accepted Christian view, it does not, for example, exactly clinch the argument to say that Christianity always upholds sanity, when the precise point at issue is the claim of the opponent that he is taking a saner view of a situation than orthodox Christianity does.

But this is decidedly a book for which to be thankful. Dr. Black has laid all his readers—and they will be many—under a debt of gratitude by supplying information and clarifying thought about topics in regard to which many of us are woefully ignorant.

The book begins with two useful chapters on Christian Science. Dr. Black allows that it is unfair to say that this is concerned entirely with physical welfare, and holds that it may help us much more comprehensively. But he refuses resolutely to be convinced by Mrs. Eddy that 'the villain of the piece' in all our cosmic thinking is our Mortal Mind, ceaselessly creating in us the illusion of 'matter,' and all the evil consequences which ensue upon this belief. He gives a well-balanced treatment of Theosophy and of Modern Spiritualism. In respect of the latter he makes the good point that for the most important 'revelations' it is absurd to depend so absolutely on mediums whom even Sir Oliver Lodge describes as 'people of low intelligence.' His very sympathetic and adequate discussion of Quakerism is followed by shorter chapters on the Catholic Apostolic Church, upon the Plymouth Brethren, Jehovah's Witnesses, the Mormons, etc. The information given will supply keenly felt gaps in the knowledge of many of us, and the critical analyses will forge weapons for those who are sorely perplexed in their minds, and troubled even practically in their daily lives, by their contacts with the adherents of these sects. The concluding chapter on British Israel is one of the best in the book, and should be very helpful to many *within* the Christian churches who are attracted by this slightly anachronistic movement.

W. S. URQUHART.

ANGLICAN MISSIONS.

It is interesting and indeed highly significant that two surveys of the work of the Church of England overseas have appeared almost simultaneously, the one dealing with the work of the Church Missionary Society (reviewed last month) and the other with the work of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. The fact would seem to indicate that one period is ending and another opening in the work of Foreign Missions. Both these books are products of collaboration between men and women who write of what they themselves know and can speak of with authority.

The second of these surveys—*The Mission of the Anglican Communion*, edited by the Bishop of Southampton and Canon Roger Lloyd (S.P.C.K.; 10s. 6d. net)—was timed to appear on the eve of the Lambeth Conference and to make its report to it. Its twenty-one contributors—mostly British, but also Indian, Chinese, Japanese, and African—by the unity of their witness justify the claim of the editors that it 'echoes what the Spirit is saying to the Anglican Communion of Churches in the Twentieth Century.'

What is the Spirit saying to them and to us? One thing stands out unmistakably. These witnesses emphasize strongly the centrality of Missions in the Church's work and the centrality of the Church in the work of Missions. It is significant that the first chapter, dealing with the theology of Missions, is largely devoted to an exposition of the views of Père Charles, S.J., of Louvain. This interest in Roman Catholic opinion is not confined to the Church of England. Père Charles and other Roman Catholic writers on Missions are being studied at the present time by others as well who are interested in the missionary enterprise, and the reason for this is, perhaps, the central place that is being given to the Church in the missionary programme of to-day. The claim Père Charles makes is that Missions have as their object the planting of the visible Church, and when that is done, and the Church planted, the process of its expansion causes Paganism to disappear by fulfilling it.

There is much to interest Protestants in this point of view and much that they may learn from it. One danger that will have to be avoided—and Roman Catholic Missions are not sufficiently on their guard against it—is the too easy acceptance into the Christian religion of elements in non-Christian religions. Syncretism has been too much practised in the past by the Roman Church and is still a danger in its missionary work. The process of 'fulfilment' has its dangers, as Mr. Blow, who writes the first article in this book, is aware, but we can agree fully that 'if we are to destroy heathenism we must fulfil it' and it is the living Church that must do that. That is why, as Canon Lloyd emphasizes in his contribution, the non-Christians 'must be fetched home to the true

flock of God . . . by a process of spiritual rather than geographical expansion.'

There is much more that is interesting and important in this volume. The emphasis on the Church which has been stressed brings with it, as the book recognizes, the urgency of 'reunion.' We can all agree with the Japanese Bishop when he calls on us to pray 'that the wounds of the body of Christ may be healed as speedily as possible.' In this great matter Lambeth can give important guidance. The chapters on 'Giving and Receiving' in the work of the Church are full of encouragement as well as (when an Indian is speaking) of rebuke.

The final contribution, by the Principal of the College of the Ascension, concludes with these words addressed to fellow-Anglicans in all lands, 'Teach us English in this little island to unlearn our insularity and become better members of this world family of Christ to which we are privileged to belong.'

NICOL MACNICOL.

THE BIBLICAL POINT OF VIEW.

One of the most difficult tasks of the Christian to-day is to relate what may be called the 'here-and-now' of his present situation to the 'then-and-there' of the Biblical revelation. To help him to bridge this gulf is the purpose of Dr. Paul S. Minear, the Norris Professor of New Testament Interpretation in Andover Newton Theological School, in *Eyes of Faith : A Study in the Biblical Point of View* (Lutterworth Press ; 15s. net). As he puts it : 'The Bible is a dangerous book, full of potential atomic energy. But only seldom is its power released, and that has usually been in times of crisis, when lives are torn loose from customary moorings. Then, for some readers, the Word is heard again with its pristine power. But only for some readers.'

What of the others ? 'Most of us render the Bible ineffectual by fitting its message into our own thought-patterns and by adapting it to our purpose, thus stepping down the high-voltage current until it serves to light our bedside table.' That is probably true enough. Most of us, quite unconsciously, wear blinkers, and if any man can help us to discard them and place us in the full light of the Biblical realism, he will deserve our grateful thanks, even though our eyes may smart for it.

Unfortunately, Dr. Minear writes in the idiom which now seems inseparable from the expositions of the Kirkegaard-Barthian School, an idiom which threatens to degenerate into pure jargon. There are some, of course, who will applaud it, and in a specifically *doctrinal* treatise it is no doubt permissible, even inevitable. But why should a man who is exhorted to discard his bedside lamp when he reads his Bible exchange it for another which, after all, is of equally contemporary manufacture ? To take a passage at random : 'God's visit to man in a specific event links the background of the absolute to the foreground of the relative in such a way that neither can be abstracted from the other without destroying the reality of the event. From a single point of standing, man views the whole horizon ; in the angle of vision is comprehended the Biblical ontology, not in abstract generalizations, but in a concrete particular story that includes the being and becoming of both God and man.' No doubt that is true. But in a book of three hundred pages of exhortation and epigrammatic paradox one is often left wondering why what is on (say) p. 100 is not on p. 50, and vice versa.

The fact is that Dr. Minear's 'Point of View' is confessedly subjective, not objective, and it may, or may not, be that of the Bible itself. That his interpretation involves an implicit repudiation of any but a subjective approach to the Bible is admitted, even urged upon his readers : 'The Bible calls for witnesses, not for teachers. It is written from faith to faith ; not from objective knowledge to faith, or from faith to objective knowledge. It demands subjective appropriation, not dispassionate evaluation.' Again, there is truth in that, and none will deny its passionate sincerity. But it is the sort of exaggeration out of which heresy is born.

Dr. Minear's book inevitably invites comparison with that of Dr. Knight, reviewed previously. Dr. Knight is capable of 'existential,' and his (sometimes difficult) language is occasionally tinged with the new theological idiom. But what he writes follows quite naturally out of his close cross-examination of the prophets ; it is not something which he weaves into their evidence. After all, if I do not become conscious of the theocentricity of the Bible by reading it with eyes as free from prejudice as I can make them, and with such companionable helps as I can find, no declamatory theology, whether Reformation, or neo-Reformation, can save me.

C. R. NORTH.

M. Alfred Loisy's 'La Naissance du Christianisme,' published in 1933, now appears in an authorized English translation under the title, *The Birth of the Christian Religion* (Allen & Unwin ; 18s. net). The translation is from the pen of Dr. L. P. Jacks, and there is a Preface by Dr. Gilbert Murray, O.M. ; so that the book appears in English under high sponsorship. Those who have read the book must be agreed that the distinguished author here offers a masterly synthesis, for which his own edition of the New Testament—published in 1922—supplies in considerable part the documentation and critical discussion, of the early history of a Movement which, as Dr. Gilbert Murray remarks, has shaped —and shaped for good through its noble qualities—the subsequent religion of the Western World. Of course M. Loisy moves in an obscure field, and is far from claiming that he has spoken the last word in critical interpretation. Indeed there has been a distinct tendency in recent years among competent students of Christian origins to regard the documentary sources as earlier and the Christian

tradition as more reliable historically than M. Loisy is inclined to allow. It may be observed that M. Loisy has never found himself in the camp of the extremists: 'the author of this book makes humble avowal of not having yet discovered that Jesus never existed.'

A Study of Psalm 72 (71), by the Rev. Roland E. Murphy, O.Carm., S.T.L. (Catholic University of America Press, Washington), is a doctoral dissertation in defence of the Messianic interpretation of Ps 72 as against the now widely current view that the Psalm is an idealized description of an actually reigning king of Judah, couched in terms of ancient Oriental *Hofstil* (Court Style). On the negative side Dr. Murphy's contention is that 'one would have to *prove* the existence (in Israel) of such an extravagant court style, before resorting to it as an explanation, when other views explain the facts equally as well, if not better.' The obvious answer to this is that no research would ever get anywhere, if *proof* were demanded at every stage in investigation. But Dr. Murphy is ready with positive arguments in support of his plea. He insists that we cannot lump all 'Royal Psalms' together and make them submit to one uniform interpretation. At the one end there are some Psalms (*e.g.* 18, 20, 21, 61, 101) which do refer to reigning kings, and in which there is no extravagant *Hofstil*. Ps 72 is different. 'Another argument against the application of *Hofstil* to Hebrew literature is to be found in the nature of kingship in Israel, the striking differences it exhibits from the same institution in foreign countries.' This plea is not simply obscurantist. Much the same case against Divine kingship ideology in the Old Testament has been urged recently by Professor Aarre Lauha, of Helsinki, in the Swedish Exegetical Yearbook, of all places. Dr. Murphy's study concludes with a summary history of the interpretation of Ps 72. His style and argumentation are clear, and he has a sense of humour. His parting shot is that Messianism, like philosophy, has a way of burying its own undertakers.

Professor F. W. Dillistone, D.D., of the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass., has collected a series of essays under the title, *The Word of God and the People of God* (Church Book Room; 3s. 6d. net). It is the first of a series of Anglican Studies in Theology. It comprises five essays which are concerned with the fundamental themes of the Word of God and the People of God, the Bible and the Church, the Gospel of Christ, and the Body of Christ. As the author says of them, 'they are inspired by the conviction that Divine truth is represented more adequately by the forms of paradox and dialectic than by those of the abstract formula and the closed system.' The essays (which are bound together in pamphlet form) express the hope that the Anglican Communion throughout the world may at this juncture be less interested in the pattern of its own particular corporate life—'the shape of its liturgy, the form of its ministry, the system of its doctrine'—than in the wider relationships between the Churches which the Oecumenical Movement seeks to encourage.

When Mr. Ellis Roberts' 'Life and Letters of Dick Sheppard' appeared it was read with deep interest by multitudes of people who were curious to know what manner of man the famous minister of St. Martin's was. It was also read by his friends with divided opinions. For Mr. Roberts painted in some spots in the sun and somewhat abated the admiration of many who had no particular knowledge of Sheppard. The unfavourable impression thus left by Mr. Roberts was resented by some (by no means all) of Sheppard's friends, and in one of the most recent volumes of the 'Modern Christian Revolutionaries' series the Rev. C. H. S. Matthews, M.A., Canon Emeritus of Coventry, has sought to remove this impression. Canon Matthews was an intimate friend of Sheppard and it is only fair that what may be called the enthusiastic portrait of Sheppard should be looked at and valued. *Dick Sheppard: Man of Peace* (James Clarke; 4s. 6d. net) will be eagerly read by those who would like to see their devotion justified, and also, it may be hoped, by many to whom the longer 'Life' is unknown.

The 'Mirfield Books,' which are put forth in the spirit of the Oxford Movement, are coming rapidly from the press. The latest issue, *So God Loved* (Dacre Press; 3s. net), by the Rev. A. E. Simpson, Canon Emeritus of Chester, considers the place of the Cross in the Christian religion. After stating the gospel of the Cross and expounding the Atonement historically the author gives a positive exposition of the Atonement under the headings of love, sacrifice, and victory. It is a thoughtful little book, and simply and attractively written.

The War saw the end of most if not all of the European journals devoted to Jewish studies. *The Journal of Jewish Studies* is intended in some measure to fill the gap. It is published by the Jewish Fellowship, and its Executive Editor is Mr. J. L. Teicher, M.A., of Cambridge. It will be issued quarterly, and subscription rates are 5s. 6d. per single copy, or one guinea for a year. Ministers, teachers, and students may purchase the Journal at the special rate of £2. 12s. 6d. for three years, post free. The first number, which contains sixty-four closely printed pages, is dedicated to the memory of the late Dr. Arthur Marmorstein, who originally projected the publication. It also contains a short article from his pen. Dr. R. Travers Herford discusses the reasons for the survival of Israel, and Dr. Israel I. Mattuck 'The Mystery of Israel,' a title under which M. Jacques Maritain has expounded his philosophy of the Jews. Other articles are by Professor Edward Robertson on 'The Altar of Earth' (Exodus xx. 24–26); by Professor O. S. Rankin on 'The Extent of the Influence of the Synagogue Service upon Christian Worship,' and by Dr. C. Rabin on 'Archaic Vocalisation in some Biblical Hebrew Names.' The Survey of Current Literature consists of

reviews by Professors O. S. Rankin and D. Winton Thomas. It is rather meagre, but this is probably because the Journal is not yet on the publishers' lists. It is clear from the list of contributors that the editors have an eye for Christian as well as for Jewish readers, and these are days when any well-sponsored venture of this kind deserves wide support.

Jewish biography is not as a rule exciting reading. Those whom Judaism delights to remember are mostly scholars like Steinschneider, whose only answer to an interviewer when asked about the course of his life was, 'My life—it is my scholarly work.' In *Essays in Jewish Biography* (Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia; $3.00) Professor Alexander Marx has written accounts of twelve such men. Four of them were mediæval rabbis, about whom either little is known, or whose lives were uneventful, namely Saadia Gaon, Rabbenu Gershom, Rashi, and Maimonides. The other eight were moderns: Moritz Steinschneider, David Hoffmann, Mayer Sulzberger, Solomon Schechter, Joseph Jacobs, Henry Malter, Max Margolis, and Israel Friedländer. The reader of the book will learn much about out-of-the-way Jewish literature and ideals, and if it be true that a great teacher survives in his scholarly works and in his pupils, there is something to be said for the claim that Professor Marx's book portrays Jewish history from the profoundest point of view.

Historians of the Puritan Revolution are fortunate in having available in the British Museum a collection of over twenty thousand pamphlets assembled by a London bookseller, George Thomason. Dr. W. Schenk, author of a scholarly study, *The Concern for Social Justice in the Puritan Revolution* (Longmans; 15s. net), has been working in this immense quarry and learning the views of men in the middle and lower ranks of society three hundred years ago, men who in quieter times would not have troubled to commit their thoughts to print.

The stage is the political and social turmoil of the age of Oliver Cromwell and the characters are Levellers, Diggers, Quakers, Fifth Monarchy Men and others; and Dr. Schenk makes them speak their parts in an interesting and stimulating fashion. There is a remarkable lack of social criticism in England from the Restoration till late in the eighteenth century; so it would seem that these Puritan Radicals failed completely. Yet something of their spirit lived on; and recent writers have even claimed them as forerunners of democratic or Marxist ideologies. Dr. Schenk shows that this is a mistaken judgment. The concern for social justice in the Puritan Radicals sprang from their religion and was largely determined by their reading of the Bible. They thought in terms of local communities far smaller than the modern State, and they had more in common with William Langland than with Karl Marx or the French Revolution.

The volume is attractively produced and may be commended to every student of Puritanism and to all interested in the development of social ideals.

An earnest expression of the longing for Revival is made in the reprint, under the title *Revive Us Again* (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 2s. 6d. net), of articles in the 'Life of Faith,' by the Rev. Philip E. Hughes, M.A., B.D. He remarks that revivals have never been the result of zealous organization and that they have invariably been preceded by special prayer. In pleading for such prayer the writer rests on the experience of such men as Samuel Rutherford, Murray McCheyne and Andrew Bonar. No reference is made to present-day conditions or experiments, and while the aim of the book commands warm sympathy this limitation of outlook seems to show a lack of belief or interest in the operation of the Holy Spirit in contemporary life and thought.

Superficially a little book on prayer with the same aim—*Golden Chains*, by the Rev. H. Mortimer Sinfield (Epworth Press; 5s. net)—seems more up-to-date. As the author is able at one place to make the suggestion that Christ's cry of dereliction was due almost entirely to mental delirium, it may be as well that he does not elsewhere aim much at profundity.

Messrs. Thomas Nelson & Sons have published a most attractive series of three books on *The Life and Teaching of Jesus*, by Principal E. F. Braley (1s. 9d. each). The small volumes (paper covers but very attractive) take the story to the Ascension. The third volume deals with the Parables and Discourses. The chapters are, in effect, paraphrases of the gospel story, and each instalment is followed by simple, illuminating questions. The chapters follow the order of events in Nelson's 'School Bible.' And, by the way, a word of strong approval may be given to that delightful little edition of the Bible, printed and bound like any other book, one of the best of the many School Bibles produced by various publishers. The present volumes may be regarded as an appendix to the 'School Bible,' and they will be invaluable to teachers or parents. The Gospel text is not printed but what is given us is a running commentary on the text, and this is very well done.

The seventh edition of an excellent book, and a very popular one as the number of editions shows, has appeared—*Every-Day Religion*, by Dr. Edward S. Woods, Bishop of Lichfield (S.C.M.; 8s. 6d. net). The Bishop is as ready with his pen as multitudes know he is ready and interesting with his voice. In this book he deals with Christianity as a way of living, passing in view its relation to politics, work, recreation, money, sex, health, beauty, and thought. It is all very delightful and helpful. And, if you have missed this book, the new edition will appeal to you when you know what it is about and how attractive a writer the author is. It would make an admirable present for a birthday.

Unsolved New Testament Problems.

Goodspeed's Theory Regarding the Origin of Ephesians.

By the Reverend C. Leslie Mitton, B.A., M.Th., Nottingham.

'Among the books of the New Testament none is more in need of clarification than the letter to the Ephesians,' writes E. J. Goodspeed. The Epistle presents several individual problems, but one major one dwarfs all the others. It is the problem of the authorship. Did Paul write it or did he not? When that is answered, other questions will need to be asked, but that is the fundamental one.

If Paul did write it, we must further inquire: When did he write it? To whom? For what purpose? Why is it so strikingly different from his other letters? It does not appear to be written to meet any particular situation, and since the words 'in Ephesus' in 1[1] are apparently not part of the original text, there is nothing to indicate to whom it was addressed.

If Paul did not write it, then why was it from the earliest times accepted and quoted as Paul's, and included without question in the earliest collection of his Epistles? What motive could have prompted a Pauline imitator to write such a letter as this, and to choose to embody in it so large a proportion of the Epistle to the Colossians?

That is the situation which needs to be clarified.

On the question of authorship most British scholars maintain that Paul wrote it, probably as a circular letter to a group of churches. One outstanding exception, however, is J. Moffatt. He decisively rejects Pauline authorship, and probably a majority of Continental and American scholars would be found to share his point of view. The arguments which they find convincing may be briefly summarized as follows:

(*a*) *Vocabulary*. The words in Ephesians which do not occur elsewhere in Paul's Epistles are of the kind which are commonly used in Christian literature belonging to the later years of the first century, for example, ἑνότης, διάβολος, ὁ ἠγαπημένος (used of Christ).

(*b*) The *style* also is peculiar. The sentences are lengthened out interminably, and, grammatically, sometimes lose themselves in the process. The terseness and vigour of Paul's style are missing. Genitives dependent on other genitives are piled up cumbrously (*e.g.*, Eph 4[13]).

(*c*) The *literary relationships* of the Epistle are unusual. Not only is a large part of Colossians reproduced in Ephesians, but, more than any other Pauline Epistle, it has affinities with non-Pauline writings, in particular with 1 Peter.

(*d*) In points of *doctrine* it is noticeably different from the rest, and many feel that the differences are irreconcilable with identity of authorship.

Not all scholars agree where the main strength of these arguments lies. McNeile, who retains Pauline authorship, avers that the argument from doctrine is the most formidable of all. For Moffatt the style is the decisive criterion. For Dibelius, on the other hand, the issue that settles the question is the relationship between Ephesians and Colossians.[1]

Against these arguments can be set the fact that from the earliest times the Epistle stands securely in the Pauline Corpus and is quoted as Paul's. No shadow of doubt falls upon it till the nineteenth century. In this it is unlike the Pastoral Epistles. Moreover it claims specifically to be Paul's, not only in the greeting, but in the main body of the Epistle. In this it differs from Hebrews. Further, it is fundamentally Pauline in its teaching, and, to a large extent, in its mode of expression also.

Most scholars are painfully aware how evenly balanced these conflicting arguments are, and consequently how difficult it is to choose decisively between them. Prolonged indecision is, however, a disquieting state of mind, and so the majority hesitatingly give the benefit of the doubt to one side, confessing at the same time that there is much to be said on the other side. Jülicher, however, persisted in keeping an open mind on the question. He fully recognized the strength of the arguments against Pauline authorship, but felt keenly certain weaknesses in the position of those who abandoned it. None of them had supplied answers to certain questions, to which he himself could find no reply: What purpose could a post-Pauline writer have had in composing such an Epistle as Ephesians? Why did he choose to use Paul's name, and write in imitation of Paul's message? Why is Colossians reproduced in it so much more extensively than any of the other Epistles? How can its peculiarly intimate and flexible use of Colossians be accounted for? If not genuine, how did the Epistle come to be immediately accepted as genuine, as early as any of the Epistles, and given its place in the first Pauline Corpus?

[1] 'Das Verhältnis von Eph zu Col bietet den Punkt dar, von dem aus die Echtheitsfrage zu entscheiden ist' (M. Dibelius, *An die Kolosser, Epheser, An Philemon*, 63).

The lack of answers to these pertinent questions withheld Jülicher from abandoning Pauline authorship, and until recently no one has attempted to supply this lack. It is the particular interest of Goodspeed's work on this problem that his theory of the origin of Ephesians does provide possible answers. Whether they may be regarded as correct answers, or even reasonably probable, is the issue now before us. He does not set out to establish the non-Pauline origin of Ephesians. He accepts it as already proved, claiming that Moffatt has presented an irrefutable case. His aim is rather to reconstruct a situation in the history of the post-Pauline Church, in which just such a work as Ephesians may have been produced.

Goodspeed's account of the origin of the Epistle is, briefly, as follows :

In the years that followed the death of Paul, the letters which he had written to the Churches were largely forgotten. Those which were not lost lay unused in the strong box of the Church which received them. Paul himself became a figure of the past, with little relevance to the needs of the present. Then, about A.D. 85, the Acts of the Apostles came into circulation among Christian people, and received an immediate and enthusiastic welcome. In it people were able to read a vivid and detailed account of some of Paul's missionary adventures. At once his name became clothed in a living personality.

Among those who had not forgotten Paul, who cherished and revered every memory of him, was one who lived in Asia Minor, and knew the Church at Colossæ. Because of his love for Paul, he had secured a copy of Paul's letter to that Church. This he had read, and re-read, till he knew it almost by heart. The reading of Acts made him aware of the other Churches which Paul had served, beyond the province of Asia. It raised in his mind the question : Did Paul perhaps write letters to some of these ? If so, copies of them must be secured. The newly awakened interest in Paul had created a demand for anything that bore his name. So this disciple of his made inquiries from the Churches mentioned in Acts, and five of them were able to make available to him letters which Paul had written to them. He was the first man ever to read the collected letters of Paul. He recognized the incalculable value for the Church of what lay before him. His heart thrilled at the unsuspected treasure in his hands. Certainly the letters must be made available to all Christian readers, that their minds might be enlightened by the spiritual discernment here revealed.

How best could this be done ? He could publish them just as they were, without comment of any kind. But if he did, would not some readers miss their abiding worth, by failing to see beyond the problems of other days and other places with which the letters primarily dealt ? Would not the whole collection become more valuable if it were preceded by a comprehensive statement of the enduring contribution of Paul to the understanding of the gospel, apart from matters of purely local or historical interest ? This commended itself to him as the course more likely to win the reader's sympathy for the great truths of Paul's message. So he set himself to prepare such an introduction, and it is this which later became known as the Epistle to the Ephesians.

His aim was to represent Paul's message, if possible, in Paul's own words, as they appeared in his letters. Since, however, the writer knew Colossians almost by heart, and had known it so much longer than the other letters, not unnaturally its phrases and theme predominated in what he wrote. What he wrote was derived from Paul. Everything of value in the Epistle he owed to Paul. So of course it must go out under Paul's name. To have introduced his own name would have been a distraction and an impertinence.

Such is Goodspeed's theory, presented and argued most persuasively in several of his books.[1] As has already been said, it has this point in its favour : it provides possible answers to those questions for which Jülicher could not find answers and for that reason maintained an open mind on the question of authorship. It suggests a motive for the production of the Epistle, and for the use of Paul's name. It accounts for the extent and the peculiar manner of the Epistle's dependence upon Colossians. It explains its unquestioned place in the earliest Pauline Corpus. It is a plausible theory ; but is it also a correct one ? Can its component parts be verified ? Does it not create more difficulties than it solves ?

The crucial points of the theory may be tested if we ask the following questions :

(1) Does it provide a satisfactory account of the relationship between Ephesians and Colossians ?

(2) Is Goodspeed right in his claim that Ephesians is a ' mosaic ' of phrases derived from the genuine letters ?

(3) Is it true that Paul's letters were forgotten after his death, until they were rediscovered, collected and published about thirty years later ? If so, is there any evidence that Ephesians stood first in this original collection, as we should expect, if it were the introduction to it ?

(1) *The Relationship between Ephesians and Colossians.* (*a*) No two Pauline Epistles have so close an interdependence on one another as these

[1] Especially in his *Meaning of Ephesians* and *Introduction to the New Testament.*

two. More than a third of the words in Colossians are reproduced in Ephesians. So large a measure of similarity cannot be due to coincidence. One Epistle has been deliberately followed in the production of the other, and there can be little doubt that it is Ephesians which has borrowed from Colossians.

(*b*) In spite of the great number of correspondences, however, there is hardly a trace of mechanical reproduction. Rarely do as many as five consecutive words in Ephesians correspond exactly with the same number in Colossians.[1] Moreover, phrases from widely separated passages in Colossians are combined in Ephesians, because of some common word or thought, by a process similar to what is often called 'conflation.' All this is quite different from what one would expect if the author of Ephesians had worked with a copy of Colossians open in front of him. It suggests rather that what he knew of Colossians was already in his mind.

These two items may seem to point to Paul himself as the author of both Epistles, and to indicate that he wrote Ephesians immediately after Colossians while the wording was still fresh in his mind. If Paul did in fact write Ephesians there can be no doubt that he must have written it almost before the ink of his letter to the Colossians was dry. This is confirmed by the almost identical reference to Tychicus as the bearer of the letter in Eph $6^{21\,f.}$ and Col 4^{7}. But this conclusion presents difficulties in view of further items in this relationship.

(*c*) Certain words and phrases are taken by Ephesians from Colossians, but used in a different sense, in a way almost incredible if it is the same author writing at the same time, without any interval for mental development. It is here that Dibelius finds conclusive evidence that a different mind is at work in Ephesians. He writes: 'What speaks decisively for its spuriousness, and at the same time against the assumption to being a circular letter sent by Paul to several Churches, is its linguistic dependence on Colossians, coupled with a completely different construction of thought.'[2] Many instances of this can be given:

(i.) The word σῶμα at Eph 4^{16} means the Church, whereas at Col 2^{19}, in the same context of words, it means the Cosmos.

(ii.) The word ἀποκαταλλάσσω is used in Colossians of God's reconciliation of man to Himself through the death of Christ. It reappears in Ephesians (and nowhere else in the New Testament), but here it is Christ Himself who effects the reconciliation, and it is not reconciliation of man and God, but of Jew and Gentile.

(iii.) The addition of ἀποστόλοις καὶ προφήταις in Eph 3^{5}, where Col 1^{26} is being substantially reproduced, seriously distorts the meaning, by drastically reducing the scope of God's revelation.

(iv.) In Colossians the μυστήριον is equated with Christ, the word of God, but not in Ephesians.

(v.) In Colossians it is twice affirmed that in Christ resides all the πλήρωμα of God. This is an inspired adaptation of a word apparently in current use among the false teachers at Colossæ. In a contemporary writing, using the same word, we would expect to find the same truth declared. In Ephesians, however, we find the word, but it is used with quite a different meaning.

(vi.) In Colossians οἰκονομία is used, as elsewhere in Paul, to mean the special commission entrusted to him by God. But in Ephesians, though the same framework of words is used, it means God's own providential ordering of His purposes.

These do not exhaust the differences, but they serve to show how difficult it is to believe that Paul wrote Ephesians immediately after completing Colossians.

On the basis of Pauline authorship we are confronted with this dilemma: the literary relationship requires that Ephesians was written immediately after Colossians, whereas the doctrinal relationship requires a considerable interval of time between them. If, however, the author was some one other than Paul, as this dilemma suggests, then his acquaintance with Colossians must have been of the kind which Goodspeed suggests. He must have known it long and intimately, so that its words, phrases and thoughts had become part of his own mental equipment, able to be used not slavishly, as a copyist uses his original, but flexibly and with adaptation.

(2) *Ephesians in Relation to the other Pauline Letters.* There is much Pauline matter in Ephesians, and this has usually been interpreted as evidence of Pauline authorship. Goodspeed, however, claims that it is due to the author's extensive borrowing from the genuine letters. In *The Meaning of Ephesians* he prints in one column the complete text of Ephesians, and in another column parallel passages from the other letters. (Colossians is treated separately in a third column.) The multitude of these passages is at first astounding, but on close examination they become less impressive. Some of the parallels are so slight as to be negligible. Other parallels occur in more than one other letter, which suggests that the phrase is one that Paul was accustomed to use, and therefore it is at least as probable that Paul

[1] The one significant and notable exception is Eph 6^{21-22} (Col 4^{7-8}).

[2] *Fresh Approach to the New Testament*, 170.

is using it again in Ephesians, as that an imitator is reproducing it.

These considerations make us cautious in using Goodspeed's lists, but should not lead us to ignore them. For even if we discount all the parallels of the kind just mentioned, there still remain a great many others. The only way to judge whether these are more than we may legitimately expect in one of Paul's own letters is to apply the same tests to an admittedly genuine one. If Philippians is examined for this purpose, we find a notable difference. Roughly, the parallels in Ephesians with passages from the other letters (not counting Colossians) amount to twice as many as those to be found in Philippians. Further, in Ephesians the parallels are derived more frequently from what are generally regarded as the more important passages in the other Epistles. In Philippians the important passages are not reflected any more than the unimportant. Striking phrases are often reproduced in Ephesians but hardly at all in Philippians. This suggests that the explanation, adequate to account for the parallels in Philippians, is insufficient for those in Ephesians.

A close study of the relationship of Ephesians with the other Paulines leaves the impression that Ephesians was written in the presence of the collected letters. It is, however, unlikely that Paul ever had the collected letters before him. Only some one other than Paul could have been in that position. There is, therefore, much to be said for Goodspeed's suggestion that Ephesians was written by one who knew Colossians nearly by heart, and who was intimately familiar with the other letters also.

(3) *The Relation of Ephesians to the Pauline Corpus.* Here we are on much more uncertain ground, because we lack the means of testing what Goodspeed claims. Harnack, and most scholars with him, visualized the growth of the Pauline Corpus as a gradual process. He assumed that the Epistles were valued from the first, and gained increasing influence in the area to which they had been sent. A Church with such a letter would be eager to obtain copies of other similar letters. Collections of the letters, therefore, varying in content, began to be made in different localities, until at last one Church had the complete collection. Harnack refuses to speculate where this first took place. This account of the formation of the Corpus has long held the field, and it is difficult to be patient with any alternative proposal. We must, however, recognize that Harnack's theory is based almost entirely on the probabilities of the case, and not on established facts. Is it possible that these have been wrongly estimated, and that in fact the Pauline Epistles, though valued enough not to be destroyed, were nevertheless ignored for a generation and perhaps forgotten? It may be so, but more evidence than has yet been produced will be needed to convince those who found Harnack's description of the process reasonable and satisfying. One piece of evidence which favours Goodspeed's theory may be mentioned. Although Acts narrates at length episodes from the missionary activity of Paul, it never so much as hints that he ever wrote a letter. It is a fair question to ask whether the author of Acts could conceivably have maintained such a silence, if, when he wrote, the Epistles were becoming as well known as Harnack's theory assumes? On Goodspeed's alternative theory the silence of Acts is explained.

If Ephesians was written as an introduction to the Pauline Corpus, presumably it stood first in it. Is there any evidence that Ephesians ever held this place? If Harnack's theory is right, there was no one original order of the letters in the Corpus, but a variety of equally original orders. But if we assume with Goodspeed that there was one act of collection, and so one original order, is there any reason to believe that Ephesians did at first hold pride of place in it? It must be admitted that there is very little evidence indeed, some would say none at all. What there is has been persuasively presented by John Knox in his *Marcion and the New Testament.* He believes that Marcion's order of the Pauline Epistles, with Galatians standing first, is in essence the original order, except for one significant alteration. Marcion's order according to Tertullian (with the number of pages, in Westcott and Hort's Text, used by each group of correspondence) is: Galatians 8¼, Corinthians 40½, Romans 26, Thessalonians 8½, Ephesians 8¾, Colossians 6, Philippians 6, Philemon 1¼. Knox argues that Marcion wanted Galatians first because it suited his own particular emphasis, and he achieved this simply by changing the places of Ephesians and Galatians. A fact that tells in favour of this is that if this were so, in the original order, after the introductory letter, the others would follow naturally in order of length. Apart from this suggestion, it is difficult to find any explanation of the order of the Epistles in Marcion's collection.

This is possible, but not by itself entirely convincing, and the other evidence Knox offers, though full of interest, is even more hypothetical.

It may be added that Goodspeed hazards a guess about the identity of the collector of the letters and the author of Ephesians. He thinks that it was probably Onesimus, Philemon's runaway slave, who is to be identified with the Bishop of Ephesus of that name, whom Ignatius commended in his

letter to the Church at Ephesus. This may not be as fanciful as at first it sounds, but it need not be more than mentioned here.

To those who have no doubt that Paul wrote Ephesians, Goodspeed's theory will appear as little more than a flight of fancy. But for those who are acutely conscious of the difficulties of Pauline authorship, it offers a possible alternative. We gather from F. W. Beare's reference to it, in his recent Commentary on 1 Peter, that it is widely accepted in America. British scholars are more cautious, though W. L. Knox describes it as 'the best explanation' and 'a convincing solution' of the problem of Ephesians.[1] At certain points it fits the facts of the case better than any known alternative. For instance, the manner in which Colossians is reproduced suggests that the author knew that letter almost by heart, but was some one other than Paul; apparently also he was acquainted with Paul's collected letters. Goodspeed's theory does justice to these two points. Whether the author was also the first collector of the letters, and whether he wrote it as an introduction to the collection, is much more uncertain. Some explanation, however, must be found to account for the fact that it was included in the Corpus from the very first.

The theory is at least a stimulating challenge to re-think the whole problem of Ephesians. It will probably prove a real contribution to its final solution, though that solution may not be precisely as Goodspeed pictures it. At our present stage of investigation, we perhaps cannot do better than accept the guarded judgment of A. J. Grieve: 'Some such solution is far from improbable.'[2]

[1] *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles*, 184.

[2] *Supplement to Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, 35.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Olympic Games.

By the Reverend J. Douglas Johnson, Shaw.

'Every athlete practises self-restraint all round; but while they do it to win a fading wreath, we do it for an unfading.'—1 Co 9[25] (Moffatt).

Did you hear the description on the Wireless of the opening of the Olympic Games? On 29th July nearly ninety thousand people from sixty-two nations came to the Wembley Stadium to hear the King proclaim open the Olympic Games of London. What a thrilling and wonderful sight it must have been. The ceremony began at two o'clock with a fanfare by the trumpeters of the Household Cavalry. Then came the scarlet Grenadiers, followed by the Scots Guards with their drums and pipes. In blazing sunshine the long procession moved into the arena. First came the athletes from Greece, the rest in alphabetical order, and in the rear Great Britain as the host. This great pageantry of colour moved past the Royal Box with standards raised in the sunlight.

At last the whole vast arena was filled to hear the speech of Lord Burghley, after which His Majesty the King declared, 'I proclaim open the Olympic Games of London celebrating the Fourteenth Olympiad of the Modern Era.' The trumpeters sounded, the Olympic Flag of five circles was broken on the white mast, and the Boy Scouts released seven thousand pigeons into the air as a symbol of peace. As the last of a salute of twenty-one guns died away a cry went up from the crowd, 'The Torch!' It must have been a great moment as John Mark, the blond, 6 ft. 3 in., quarter-miler, circled the track bearing aloft the burning torch, kindled twelve days before at the ancient Temple of Zeus in the Greek town of Olympia.

Do you understand the meaning of the five circles of the Olympic Flag? They represent the five continents of the world. The new stamps celebrating the Games also bear the five circles. Surely, it can only be a good thing that all the countries of the world should take part together in the Olympic Games in the true spirit of brotherhood. Do you remember how Jesus taught us to regard one another, no matter what our race or language, as being equally brothers and sisters of the great world family? The peoples of the world are really one, and they have one Father in God.

What of the flame of the torch which is never quenched? It made me think of what Jesus said both about Himself and His followers being the light of the world. When our Lord Jesus came into a dark world a torch was lit which has never gone out. 'Let your light shine before men,' Jesus said, 'that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.' So boys and girls who belong to the Church of Jesus Christ pray:

> God make my life a little light
> Within the world to glow;
> A little flame that burneth bright,
> Wherever I may go.

I could not help wondering what St. Paul would have thought had he been present at this opening ceremony! Sports and games were well known to him. Why, he once spoke of himself as being

like a boxer who is always careful to train and discipline his body. The track-runner is a familiar figure in his letters, and the Apostle offers wise advice to all athletes. First, the runner must practise and train hard, being temperate in all things; second, he must learn to keep his eye fixed on the goal; and third, he must run straight, without swerving.

I am quite sure both Paul and his Master, Jesus Christ, would agree that the great thing in life's race for us all is that we should do our best. It may not be given to everyone of us to be a prize-winner in this life. At the end of the description on the Wireless, the commentator quoted the words: 'the important thing is not so much winning as taking part, not so much conquering as fighting well.'

Perhaps this is a favourite hymn of yours. The words are well worth thinking about.

Fight the good fight with all thy might;
Christ is thy strength, and Christ thy right;
Lay hold on life, and it shall be
Thy joy and crown eternally.

Run the straight race through God's good grace,
Lift up thine eyes, and seek His face;
Life with its way before thee lies;
Christ is the path and Christ the prize.

The Traffic Jimp.

By the Reverend J. R. Julian, Sheffield.

'He is able to keep that which I have committed unto him.'—2 Ti 1^{12}.

Have you been introduced to our new enemy? 'Enemy,' you say, 'I do not want to be introduced to an enemy, but only to those who are going to be my friends.' Yet, the unpleasant fact is that we all have got to be introduced to a new enemy, whether we like it or not. The B.B.C. has introduced us, and so have newspapers and periodicals. He is the Traffic Jimp. If you have seen him already you will know that he is a naughty little imp with a most engaging smile who tempts us to do all the things we shouldn't when we are on the road. He says to the motorist—'Come on, slow-coach, you'll never get past if you don't pull out and have a try.' And so he tempts the motorist to overtake a big van when he cannot see whether the road is clear or not. He tempts him to speed where he should 'Drive Slowly.' He also tempts the cyclist to wobble about in the middle of the road, or ride on the wrong side. And the pedestrian, too, comes under his influence when he is tempted to cross where there is no Pedestrian Crossing, or to cross the road without looking each way to see if it is all clear. So accidents occur generally because people will listen to the Jimp. May none of us be taken in by him.

There is another road we all are travelling—the road of life. It has its Traffic Jimp too. We meet him constantly and he is the cause of a great many accidents. The Bible calls him Satan. He tries to tempt everybody on life's road. He even came to Jesus, you remember, while He was in the wilderness. 'Turn these stones into bread,' he said. 'Jump from the pinnacle of the Temple, and see how God will keep you from harm.' Taking Him to the top of a hill from which there was a wide view he promised to give Him 'the kingdoms of the world' if He would worship him. But Jesus would not. He resisted every approach of this Jimp—Satan. 'Get thee behind me, Satan,' He cried.

Recently I was in a house where a small boy had been given a bicycle for his birthday. His father and mother were afraid that he might have an accident on the road, so they were telling him that he must keep on the right side. But the boy was finding it very difficult to understand which was the right side, and which was his left hand. 'How can I be right when I am left, Mother,' he said. Then his mother gave him a splendid answer —'Keep on your blazer pocket side,' she said. And our blazer pockets are over our hearts. If we keep on our heart's side of life's road, and our hearts are in the keeping of the Lord Jesus Christ, we shall meet with no accidents, for 'He is able to keep that which we have committed unto him.' Life's Traffic Jimp will not have his way with us then.

The Christian Year.

Seventeenth Sunday after Trinity.

Self-Forgetfulness.

By the Reverend R. W. Stewart, B.D., B.Sc., Killermont.

'They have ascribed unto David ten thousands, and to me they have ascribed but thousands.'—1 S 18^{8}.

One of the many places in the Old Testament giving not a plain lesson but a glimpse into human nature is this verse about Saul. There had been a great battle against the Philistines and a song of triumph had been written about it which the King heard the women of Israel sing—'Saul hath slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands.'

These were pretty big figures, even for a poet on a Victory Day! Saul might well have felt that they were 'doing him proud,' in fact exaggerating a good deal in his honour. But the words gave offence to the jealous monarch. What was the need for that silly line about David? Saul was greedy for all the personal glory of the success. Such an attitude is fortunately not universal, and it is easy to collect examples of a very different temper.

Thirty years ago when Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Webb had become famous through their tireless researches and propaganda concerning social reform, that brilliant journalist, A. G. Gardiner, said of them, 'It would not be possible to find two more wholly disinterested people in London. They have no axe to grind, no selfish purposes to serve.'

They toiled on for another generation at the

same work, and recently, in her sketch of Mrs. Beatrice Webb, Margaret Cole says the same thing once more about Sidney. 'He was entirely devoid of any desire to claim credit for his own work; if the pamphlet or whatever it was would be more effective if it appeared anonymously, let it so appear, or under the name of any one carrying more weight or seeming more impartial who would be prepared to sign it. This disinterestedness, this utter lack of personal vanity of any kind, has been for all his life one of the most marked characteristics of Sidney Webb. He never minded at all, provided the work was done, who got the credit for it.'

This self-forgetful spirit is always impressive. Sir George Arthur wrote about the secret of Lord Kitchener's influence. 'Kitchener appealed to the masses as supremely trustworthy because he was supremely selfless. Year after year the people's regard waxed stronger for the soldier of whom the last thing that could be said would be that he courted attention.' Fifty years ago no statesman was so trusted in English politics as the Duke of Devonshire because he seemed to have no private interests to serve and to be utterly unambitious. In the American Civil War President Lincoln was once kept waiting by an unmannerly general. Some one commented angrily; but 'never mind!' said Lincoln, 'I will hold McClellan's horse for him if only he will bring us success.' A similar remark is made by the Apostle Paul in one letter written from a prison. Some people were preaching not so much because they were in earnest as because they wished to make Paul jealous that others could preach as well as, or better than, he could, while he, shut up in prison, could not preach at all. 'What then?' says Paul, 'only that in every way Christ is proclaimed; and therein I rejoice, yea, and will rejoice.'

Yet what need of varied illustrations when the example of the common soldier is familiar. He does not fight to survive, but that a position may be held or won. His heroic acts are not done to win decorations but to be faithful to his comrades and his cause. To each one might be applied Francis Thompson's words about the dead Cardinal, 'He serveth not for praise.'

Such instances lead far away from Saul's jealous greed for all the glory. Every one in his moments of high thought would wish to belong to the noble company of the self-forgetful, though it is not easy in the common round of life. 'When thou doest alms,' said Jesus, 'let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth.' Yet men like public thanks and praise. It is difficult to play second fiddle well and cheerfully, to be quite happy to work behind the scenes and let others take the credit.

It may be said that such sins as jealousy, pride, ambition, must be watched for and fought against. But it may be argued that no direct attack on them is really possible. Victory over them will be reached unconsciously, if it is reached at all. For the cure is not to think less of self, it is much more drastic, it is not to think of self at all, to be self-forgetful.

Meredith's lovely but difficult poem, *The Woods of Westermain*, is an allegory on the subject. He describes the enchanted woods, which stand for life with all its interest. Wandering there

> Nothing harms beneath the leaves
> . . . . .
> Fair you fare.

But if for a moment you begin to be frightened you quickly grow terrified. You mark the mossy-footed squirrels, the deep note of the moth-winged night-jar, the myriad shy creatures of the wild intent on their business, but suddenly, if you become self-conscious, panic grips you.

So on the way through life everything is there to enjoy, to occupy mind and muscle, as long as you keep from asking, 'What about me?' 'Where do I come in?' But when that self-centred thought enters, there enter a thousand fears, and everything is poisoned.

In one place in the Book of Jeremiah that prophet says in the name of God to his young helper Baruch, 'Seekest thou great things for thyself? Seek them not: . . . but thy life will I give unto thee for a prey.' The words are capable of a finer interpretation than the common one, that Baruch would escape with his life. Though Baruch was for the moment sunk in despondency he had been standing dauntlessly beside the prophet. Was Jeremiah's comfort for this young hero to tell him that he will be sure to save his own skin? Surely the nobler interpretation must be true, that he would preserve the integrity of his soul. The career this young nobleman had chosen, to be secretary and helper to Jeremiah, preferring this to any Court appointment, would bring him no reward except the satisfaction of living the life he counted best, and at its end he will feel not like a hunter who has spent the day in vain and missed his quarry but like one who returns with a heavy bag. 'Thy life will I give unto thee for a prey,' for it will be its own worthwhile reward.

One may find an illustration in the familiar operetta *Lilac Time*, which depicts the life of Schubert in gay Vienna, and embodies many of his lilting melodies that were to become world-favourites. It shows the young musical genius enjoying the company of his friends, yet always struggling with poverty and shyness, a wistful figure, almost a failure. And yet one is not made altogether sorry for him. For he has always another song in his heart, and living in and for his music all the time he has the life which he has chosen and in which he is content.

There are other spheres than art in which one sees this utter self-forgetfulness. One has known doctors, teachers, scientists, humbler toilers, who were absorbed in their work, intent on their service of men, heedless of gain or glory, so set on their aim that they had no thought of self. And Christ is the supreme example. He sought nothing for Himself. He lived and died for others. Remember His words, 'Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls.'

EIGHTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The First and Great Commandment.

BY THE REVEREND JOHN R. GRAY, B.D., TH.M., GLASGOW.

'Jesus said . . . Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment.,—Mt $22^{37ff.}$

There can be no sort of question that Christianity is through and through a moral religion. The love which is its core is not some purely spiritual emotion. It is intensely and vitally practical. That we learn from Jesus' own example who was quite unable to keep Himself out of people's troubles or withdraw Himself from their needs. And He Himself has told us that the final criterion of every life is kindness. 'Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my children, ye have done it unto me.'

Modern man gives at least lip service to this idea of love of neighbour. We approve of kindness. And when our good intentions, our mild and placid benevolence results in two major wars in a generation, crisis after crisis, strikes and disputes, and in the narrower sphere the unhappy mess in which most of our own lives are spent, we look ruefully at the smashed bits of our lives and other folks' lives and say, 'Well! I'm sure I *meant* well. I didn't intend any harm.' But the harm is done. Why is it so? Where have we gone wrong? Is it not all due to the fact that we ignore the priority which Christ has given to the Commandment: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God.' We pass it over as a matter of pious theory and rush on to the real, practical thing—love of neighbour. When we try to carry it out we find it to be impossibly difficult. We may have some success in loving our neighbour in China or Africa. It becomes harder when we think of Russian or Jew, and proves quite unworkable with regard to our political opponents or the person across the way. And so we don't trouble further, and give them both up—the First Commandment as impractical and the Second as impracticable. The discouraged disciples of Social Action or of the Ethical System of Jesus will make some impression on this stubborn world only when they learn to put first things first. There can be no question that the apparent sterility of Christianity in our day arises largely from our mistaking a vague sentimentality, a muddled benevolence, for the stern austerity of the gospel. It is true that John once said, 'He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen.' It is equally true to say, however, 'How can a man love his brother whom he sees to be in so many ways unlovely and unlovable, if he loves not God who is so altogether lovable, without spot or defect?' Only love begets love. And if the unchanging, unfathomable, redeeming love of God in Christ cannot move our cold, ingrown hearts, how can we be touched by the flickering, uncertain, often selfish affection of those among whom we live?

There is no doubt at any rate about where Christ laid the emphasis, of what priority He gave. For Him the love of God is first and the love of the neighbour is a secondary thing, quite inevitable and inescapable if we love God, quite impossible if we don't. Until we love God, we have done nothing. And if we think of it even a little we shall see that, once we do love God, we have done all. If we really listened to this Commandment we should be shocked and humbled and challenged and profoundly changed—in our inmost selves and in our relationship to our neighbours as well as in our relationship to God.

1. Our inmost selves are changed. There is nothing natural man likes so much as a set of rules. He may not keep them but he likes them. They limit what he may do but they also by implication limit what he must do. We like the five-day week and the eight-hour day, not because we like to work for five days a week and eight hours a day but because we need not work more than five days a week or eight hours a day. We like the Ten Commandments because they leave us free to do whatever is not forbidden there. They tell us, for example, to keep the Sabbath holy and that is a nuisance at times, but they don't tell us to keep the other six days holy. Natural man rejoices in the implied freedom to do what he likes for six days out of seven. They not only limit our freedom. They limit our obligations. They give us off-duty time.

In this Commandment Jesus shatters that illusion. He says in effect: 'God does not demand obedience, nor a good action from you. He demands you.' You are not your own—not any of you and not any part of you. God made you and He has bought you—all of you, and He will not rest content till all of you is His. He will not rest content till the last trace of selfishness, the last vestige of pride is gone. He gives Himself to you and you must give—not this thing or that—but yourself to Him. 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.' And if and as we do—and, of course, we never do till our nerveless fingers finally relax and limply and of necessity we let go our grasping hold on houses and lands and position and friends and reputation and all; but if and as we begin to love Him, begin to yield ourselves to Him, we find that not of compulsion but inevitably our relationship to others is changed.

2. So long as we live by the Commandments our obligations to others are limited. We may not kill them or steal from them or covet them but there it ends. The 'I' is still shut up in itself, dour and lonely but defiant, seeking to defeat 'the other' or dominate 'the other' or cajole 'the other,' looking with suspicious, wary eyes on those who distrust it and whom it distrusts. Once the love of God has come flooding into a heart, then the loneliness has gone and the defiance. Open to admit God, it cannot shut the gates against 'the other.' Remember Zacchæus. No sooner had the love of God in Christ come to his home and heart than he set about putting right his relationship

with his neighbours. So it always is. The things which divide man from man and nation from nation cannot be smoothed out or explained away. If I am my own God, I cannot help but hate 'him' who is his own God. Gods never could agree. Dewey and Truman, Churchill and Bevan, Sokolovsky and General Robertson may come to a truce. They will never come to an understanding with each other, never be brothers, until both say 'Father' to the same God. Only where there is love of God, can love of man truly begin.

3. The love of God begins only when and where and if God's love is known. So long as we stand in proud defiance of God we can know only the shadow of His love—His wrath. So long as we know only the wrath of God, His fierce commandments, we stand in proud defiance of Him. That is the dilemma of man. Until God loves him, he cannot love. Until he loves God, God cannot love him. That hateful circle of despair can be broken only by a miracle. It is broken only by the central miracle of the Cross, in which the hot wrath of God upon man's sin is turned in upon Himself and from the broken body there streams forth the message of the free, undeserved, despised, rejected love of God. 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God.' This is no commandment. It is a gift that comes with the gift of the love of God in Christ to save us. I cannot tell you to love God, for love cannot be demanded. I can only point to the Cross on which the love of God for you is blazoned forth. It is as we gaze at it that the miracle of grace begins to be wrought in our hearts and the First and Great Commandment begins to be obeyed.

Love so amazing, so divine,
Demands my soul, my life, my all.

NINETEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Truth.

BY THE REVEREND J. C. MORTON, CRESWELL, NEAR WORKSOP.

'I am . . . the truth.'—Jn 14^{6}.

This is a stupendous claim, and it is so because we do not normally associate the goal of our quest for truth with a person. Truth, we say, is abstract and impersonal. Reason is the faculty by which we apprehend truth, and logic the method. Every great system of thought that has ever appeared is a testimony to man's quest for truth, to his search for what is ultimate and final in life. Names like Socrates and Plato, Descartes and Kant, Whitehead and Russell remind us not only of man's quest but of his achievement: for the systems of thought associated with these names are expressions of the truth as they have seen it.

It is, therefore, something of a presumption for an unknown and untutored Galilean to affirm Himself the truth, the ultimate and final truth, the last word about God and man. So men have reasoned, and in all probability will continue to do so while human pride and folly persist. Nevertheless Christianity takes its stand on this fact, and affirms that the ultimate truth of life is summed up in the Person of Jesus Christ. Now there is nothing extravagant about this claim. It is, in fact, both reasonable and natural.

For, in the first place, truth cannot be separated from a person. The two always go together. You are familiar for instance with the word Platonism, and you know that it represents a system of philosophy which came into being a few hundred years before Christ, and is probably the noblest attempt on the part of man to arrive at truth. Platonism has influenced practically every system of thought throughout the world, and has even left its mark on Christian doctrine and belief. But Platonism is, as its name suggests, connected with a person. It represents the thought and judgment of the man Plato, and it cannot rightly be understood apart from him, apart from the circumstances of his life and experience.

Or come a little nearer to our own time. Two of the most popularly used words of the day are Marxism and Communism. For all practical purposes they are synonymous, for you cannot think of one without thinking of the other. Now Communism is not abstract truth. It is the nearest thing to a faith or a way of life that our modern civilization has seen. It might even be described as a religion, though a debased and pagan religion, a religion without God. Its impact upon the world has been tremendous and its influence for the future is almost incalculable. And yet Communism cannot be understood simply by looking at Russia. It can only be understood by looking at it through the life and experience of its creator Karl Marx. The two things must always go together. The person and the system of thought created by the person. They are inseparable.

It need occasion no surprise, therefore, that Christianity should assert that the final truth of life is summed up in the Person of Jesus Christ. For Christianity is Christ in a way that can never be said of Platonism that it is Plato, or of Marxism that it is Marx. These systems are the expression of the minds and experiences of their creators. But Christianity is more than an expression of the mind and experience of Christ. It is the revelation of the will and purpose of the eternal God. It is God's final and complete disclosure of Himself to the world. And that revelation is fulfilled and perfected in Christ. That is why we say He is the truth, the ultimate and final truth that cannot be repeated.

The next thing I want to say is that the apprehension of this truth is something which cannot be separated from life. Let me put it this way. The final truth we desire to know is truth about the universe and life, and therefore truth about God and of our relationship with Him, since truth about life has no meaning apart from truth about God.

Now this truth is not given to men in isolation and detachment from life. Some men adopt the rôle of spectator, and by withdrawing to some

vantage point they imagine they can apprehend truth. But nothing could be further from truth than this spectator attitude. Truth comes from experience. It is given to man as he meets life in all its ways and at every point.

Some of you older folk will remember that when you were at school one of the tasks you had to perform was to write essays on various subjects. For instance, you might have to write about Spring, and to prepare yourself for this you were either given a text-book to read, or the teacher instructed you concerning the truth about Spring. To-day, however, they do things differently. This wholly detached and academic approach gives place to experience. To-day if children have to write an essay on Spring they are first taken for a walk through the country-side. They are taught to observe things for themselves. They are taught to listen for the song of the birds. They are shown the spring flowers and the budding hedgerows. They see Nature and the spring season at first hand, and fresh from their contact with life they return to their class-rooms to write of the things they have seen and felt and known. So it is with our apprehension of the truth about God and life. It comes from experience. It cannot be separated from life.

Moreover a man apprehends this truth not only by doing something but by being something. If there is one condition above all others that has to be fulfilled it is the condition of personal righteousness. For righteousness is a matter of right relations between the self and God. It is not the acceptance of a mere idea. It is commitment to a particular way of life. To know the truth about God and life therefore demands a right moral attitude. Or, to put the same thought in a negative way, you cannot know the truth in unrighteousness. Wrong living and wrong thinking go together. As Dr. Baillie has put it: 'The vision of God cannot be shut from our lives by wrong thinking only unaccompanied by wrong living.' And I am sure that is a point which cannot be over-emphasized.

During the War years I found myself taking part in innumerable discussions on this question of the quest for truth, and the more it went on the more amazed I became at the way men resorted to all manner of rationalizations to avoid coming to grips with truth. It was quite obvious they were afraid of truth, and they were afraid of it because of unrighteousness. Wrong living predisposes wrong thinking, and man erects all manner of defences to avoid what he knows must be a challenge and a judgment. This is what I mean when I say the apprehension of truth cannot be separated from life. Ultimate final truth can only be known by being something. It demands righteousness of life. 'Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God.' There is no way round that.

The final thing I want to say is that truth can only be known by an act of commitment to a Person. The difference between Christianity and all other systems is that Christianity has primarily to do with a Person, whereas all other systems have to do with ideas. A Jewish scholar has made the same distinction between Christianity and Judaism. 'Judaism,' he says, 'is the religion of ideas while Christianity is a religion of a Person.' Christianity claims that the ultimate, final truth of life is revealed in Christ. And if, as we have said, man's quest for truth is a quest for truth about God and life, then the end of the quest must be in this commitment of self to a Person, since Christ as the supreme revelation of God to the world is Himself the ultimate, final truth of life. That conclusion is inescapable if you agree that man's quest for truth is truth about God. Of course, if you reject that starting point then the conclusion doesn't follow. But the significant thing is that few do reject that starting point. Almost every system of thought the world has produced has to do in some way or other with this question of ultimate things. And to all the questions Christianity provides the answer in Christ. He is the truth.

If, therefore, you would know the truth you must know Him, and that means committing yourself to Him. But this is just what many are not prepared to do. They would like to know Christ, but in an academic and detached sort of way. The intimate knowledge born of personal commitment and experience they do not desire. They are even suspicious of it. But as Dr. John Mackay has said: 'Christ can never be known by men who would be His patrons but only by those who are prepared to become His servants.' The trouble with far too many seekers, and even would-be followers, is that they offer Him their patronage. They accept Him but with reservations, and their reservations are a bigger thing than their acceptance. That is why the service they render to Him is always so mean and paltry. But Christ doesn't want patronage. He wants men and women. He wants you. And you will never know the meaning of life until you know Him in an act of surrender, until you become not His patrons but His willing servants.

This is something about which many of us can speak from experience. For this commitment of the self to Christ, involving as it does a commitment in thought as well as in the warmth of experience, has not been undertaken without some cost. Our faith is not an inherited faith. We have passed through the wilderness of speculation and of doubt. For some of us the experience was equivalent to that of Amiel who frankly confessed that he had no belief because all his studies ended in a note of interrogation. There was a time when our studies ended in a note of interrogation. Until we found Christ. Then we found the truth. Then we entered into the possession of life's most abiding things. And the conviction has since grown that nothing so satisfying and so enriching could have happened to us as this. Not that all our questions have been answered. They haven't, and we don't expect them to be. But we have been given insight into the meaning of things, which is more then the answering of questions. We have entered into the possession of the truth, and the truth has made us free.

TWENTIETH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Destined Unity.

BY THE REVEREND WILLIAM BARCLAY, B.D., GLASGOW.

'Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Jesus Christ.'—Col 1^{28}.

Never was the destined unity of all men in Christ so stressed and repeated as in this text. See how in the one text the one phrase, 'every man,' recurs no less than three times; see how 'every man' is to be made 'perfect' in 'all wisdom' in Christ Jesus. It is as if Paul wished to drive home this destined unity by repeated hammer blows.

This destined unity in Christ has more than one aspect and more than one direction.

1. In Christ and in Christ alone *the individual man becomes a unity*. Almost the first thing that a thinking man discovers about himself is that he himself is a kind of battle-ground of warring and opposing forces.

I know my soul hath power to know all things;
Yet is she blind and ignorant of all;
I know I'm one of nature's kings;
Yet to the least and vilest things I'm thrall;
Yet to conclude I know I am a man
Which is a proud and very wretched thing.

Some one has described life as 'an endless war of contrarieties.' Robert Burns—and no one ever knew this war of opposing forces better than he did—once wrote, 'My life reminded me of a ruined temple; what strength, what proportion in some parts; what unsightly gaps, what ruin in others.' In his autobiography Jerome K. Jerome tells of a talk he had with a friend, Philip Bourke Marston. Marston confessed to him that in himself he found three Philips. One was an evil thing full of lusts and horrors, lower than any beast that crawls; another was beautiful, a creature whom Christ would have loved; and there was still another who stood, as it were, apart. 'There are times when he looks into my very soul and I shrivel up with shame; and there are moments when I feel as if he had entered into me and we were one.'

Every one knows how we say something of which afterwards we are ashamed and how we say to ourselves, 'What made me say that?' Or how we do something that brings pain and hurt and sorrow and how we say, 'What possessed me to do that?'

Every one of us is to some extent a split personality, a disunity. There is only one cure for this. It is for some new power, for some power greater than ourselves, to enter into us and to take possession of us. Only when Christ becomes the centre and the soul of life for us is the disunity gone and the destined unity come. We find our victory by surrender to Him.

2. In Christ and in Christ alone *the activities of life become a unity*. One of the supreme dangers of life is the compartmented life. There is so often in our thinking and in our assessing of things a false difference between what we call sacred and secular. Sometimes one would almost think that we as good as say to Jesus Christ, 'I will company with you in church; I will come near to you in the worship of God's house; but when I leave this place you must stay here because the world is no place for you and I cannot take you with me there.' One of the hall-marks of the consecrated life is that in it everything is sacred, everything is done in the presence of Christ and for Christ. Rita Snowden somewhere tells of a rather pious visitor who was asking questions at an orphanage. The visitor turned to a servant girl and said to her with a kind of conscious superiority, 'Well, my girl, what do you do for Jesus Christ?' Back came the answer like a shot, 'I scrubs floors, mum.' And why not? Scrubbing floors can be every bit as consecrated a work as preaching sermons. Livingstone wrote in his journal, 'I feel that I am not my own. I am serving Christ when shooting a buffalo for my men or taking an astronomical observation or writing to one of His children who forget.' All life to him was a sacred thing. In Zechariah there is a wonderful vision of the new world which shall be. In that world the bells on the horses; the pots and pans in the house of the Lord; and every pot in Jerusalem and Judah shall be holiness unto the Lord of hosts (Zech $14^{20.\ 21}$). Not only the utensils of the Holy Temple but the utensils of the common kitchen would be holiness unto the Lord.

When this unity enters into life, when men work not for pay, not for honour, not for prestige, not merely to satisfy an earthly master, when there is no difference between sacred and secular, when all work is done for Christ and in the presence of Christ, the Kingdom of God will be on the way.

3. In Christ and in Christ alone can there be *unity in the Church*. It may well be that the greatest handicap the Church has is her own disunity. 'Like a mighty army moves the Church of God' is so very far from being the truth. In the destined unity of the Church there will not and cannot be simply an elimination of differences. The differences will remain. Some one has made a kind of parable of the thing like this. Every one likes to sing. But if a crowd of people all want to sing and all sing different tunes the result is merely an unpleasant noise. If they submerge their differences and all sing the one tune in unison then there is an improvement. But if they sing in harmony, the sopranos, the contraltos, the tenors and the basses, each singing their own line of melody, then all the parts are woven into real and great music. The destined unity of the Church must be like that. It must issue not in a flat uniformity, but in a harmony where each makes its own contribution. When John Wesley's nephew entered the Roman Catholic Church Wesley wrote him, not upbraiding him, sad, it is true, but by no means angry, 'You may be saved in any church and you may be damned in any church. What matters is, How is your heart with God?' Hugh Matheson in his autobiography tells us how

impressed he was with the Methodist Church invitation to Communion, 'To all those who love the Master and who wish to live in closer communion with Him.' It will be a great step to the destined unity of all things when the churches remember that they all love and serve the one Master and forget for ever the lesser things which so tragically divide them.

4. Only in Christ can there be *the destined unity of all men.* Writing of this letter of Paul's E. J. Goodspeed quotes a paragraph from the writings of Mr. Walter Lippmann. Mr. Lippmann says, 'No teacher has ever appeared in the world who was wise enough to know how to teach his wisdom to all mankind. In fact, the great teachers have attempted nothing so utopian. They were quite well aware how difficult for most men is wisdom, and they have confessed frankly that the perfect life was for a select few. It is arguable, in fact, that the very idea of teaching the highest wisdom to all men is the recent notion of a humanitarian and romantically democratic age, and that it is quite foreign to the thought of the greatest teachers.' But it is no new thought or conception. From the very beginning Christianity was for all men. It came into a world where the Jew, in his every morning prayer, thanked God that he was not 'a Gentile, a slave, or a woman.' It came into a world where the Greek was quite sure that some men existed only to be hewers of wood and drawers of water for the privileged few. It speaks to a world to-day where once again the barriers are up, the barriers between race and race, the barriers between class and class, the barriers between party and party. The only thing in the world which can transcend all this is Christianity because Christianity sees man not as a member of any race or any class or any party but as a son of God. It is precisely in that fact that the sheer necessity of Christianity lies. The day when all men are one will surely come because God has given to Christ a name which is above every name, a name at which every knee shall bow. It is a *destined* unity. But some one has drawn a distinction between fate and destiny. 'Fate is that which we are *compelled* to do; destiny is that which we are *meant* to do.' Soon or late the destined unity will come. It is ours to help or to hinder its coming. Let us see to it that by our work, by our labours, by our prayers, by our life and by our example we hasten the day when all men shall be one because all men shall be in Christ.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Elements of Old Testament Thought. For more than a century the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* has maintained its place amongst the leading German theological journals, until, like so many others, it came to a temporary end with the beginning of the War. Now it has resumed its appearance, but in the form of separate monographs, so that each issue has a unity which is not ordinarily found in a journal. The second issue of the new series is by Professor O. Eissfeldt, of Halle, and is entitled *Historical and Supra-historical Elements in the Old Testament.*[1] It contains three studies, each complete in itself, on 'People and "Church" in the Old Testament,' 'Eternity in the Old Testament,' and 'Is the God of the Old Testament also the God of the New Testament?' In the first study Professor Eissfeldt traces the development within the Old Testament period towards the concept of a 'Church,' and briefly notes how the New Testament carries that development farther forward. In the second study he observes that in the thought of the Old Testament eternity belongs to God and not to man, or to God's Kingdom in contrast to human kingdoms, and that such reachings out towards a belief in human immortality as are found are vague and uncertain. Here again he carries us in a brief closing paragraph into the New Testament where eternal life is presented as derived from God through obedience to His word in Christ. The final study argues that the God of the Old Testament is the God of the New, but not by simple equation. There is development in the thought of God, and a historical sense is required of the Biblical theologian. Within the Old Testament Professor Eissfeldt distinguishes four periods, with especial emphasis on the profound significance of the work of Moses, and shows that while the elements of the New Testament thought of God are already found in the Old Testament, there is a difference of emphasis. Thus while the Old Testament presents the concept of God as Father, this is less characteristic or dominant in Old Testament thought than in that of the New. Hence, while the continuity of the Old and New Testaments is to be recognized, and the debt which the New owes to the Old is to be acknowledged, the difference between the two Testaments is not to be blurred. These judicious studies are to be commended, and not least for the evidence they offer that this distinguished scholar without losing anything of his scholarship is profoundly interested in the spiritual significance of the Old Testament.

[1] *Geschichtliches und Übergeschichtliches im Alten Testament* [1947]. Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, Berlin.

Syrian Cults. An earlier work of Professor Eissfeldt's, published during the War in 1941, has recently reached me from the author. This is entitled *Temples and Cults of Syrian Towns in the Hellenistic-Roman Period.*[2] It treats of the archæological finds at Gerasa, Baalbek, Palmyra,

[2] *Tempel und Kulte syrischer Städte in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit* [1941]. Hinrichs, Leipzig.

and Dura, and particularly of the remains of temples and the information we have of the cults and the deities worshipped. In each case there is a brief account of the history of the town. Professor Eissfeldt shows that fundamentally the religion of these towns remained what it had been, and that Hellenistic and Roman influence only affected the form and not the essence of that religion, which was closely akin to the Baalism of the Old Testament. At the end of the book there are some excellent plates illustrating the text of the work.

Theologische Zeitschrift. The three latest numbers of the Swiss journal *Theologische Zeitschrift* [1] lie before me, and all that I can do is to indicate the themes of the principal articles they contain. In the first of them K. L. Schmidt writes on 'The Figurative Language in the Apocalypse'; O. Cullmann on 'The New Testament Problem of the Unrealized Parousia'; and K. Goldammer on 'The Life and Personality of Paracelsus.' In the second J. Sløk gives a brief review of 'Contemporary Danish Theology'; G. Wingren writes on 'Spiritual and Temporal Authority in the Teaching of Luther'; and E. Grin on 'Some Aspects of Calvin's Thought on the Holy Spirit' (this article is written in French). In the third C. Maurer argues that the textual variation in Ac 20[5] offers the clue to the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles, which all come from a single, naïve author of a post-Pauline generation; E. Buess writes on 'Jeremias Gotthelf, the Poet-Preacher, and His Time'; and G. Rizza discusses the significance of the Oslo Conference. In addition all three numbers contain some important reviews, and short notes—especially more of L. Koehler's etymological and exegetical notes—and information about theological scholarship and scholars in many lands. The journal fully maintains its early promise, and is very valuable to all who would keep abreast of theological work generally.

The Arabic Book. Professor Johannes Pedersen, whose masterly work *Israel: Its Life and Culture* is widely known, has recently published in Danish a learned work on *The Arabic Book*.[2] It treats of the technicalities of the production of the Arabic book in ten chapters, starting from the earliest Arabic inscriptions and pre-Islamic writings, and finishing with a chapter on the printed book. It contains a chapter on the Koran, which is not merely of supreme importance to the whole Arabic-speaking world by reason of its sacred character, but which has exercised an immeasurable influence on the language and literature, and has inspired the choicest examples of calligraphy, illustration, and binding. All of these questions of production are both examined and illustrated by Professor Pedersen, whose own book is finely produced with the aid of a grant from the Carlsberg Foundation, of which he is the President. The coloured plates of illumination and binding are more eloquent than anything that can be written about them to show the heights that were reached by the Arabic craftsmen of earlier days.

The Koran. From the Hungarian Islamic scholar, Professor J. de Somogyi, comes a small volume of *Selections from the Koran*, translated into Hungarian,[3] together with brief notes, and a short introduction. Altogether forty-seven Suras are translated, in whole or in part, mainly Meccan Suras. To read Hungarian is beyond my capacity, but I am informed by Mr. P. R. Weis, of the Manchester University Semitics staff, that the translation takes account of the latest results of scholarship in the field of Koranic studies, and is both faithful to the original and in good idiomatic Hungarian.

The Problems of Colossians and Ephesians. From Sweden comes another large and important work, this time from the pen of Ernst Percy, whose shorter study on the Body of Christ was noticed previously in this magazine.[4] The present volume runs to more than five hundred pages, and is devoted to a study of *The Problems of the Epistles to the Colossians and the Ephesians*.[5] The author first offers an exhaustive examination of the style, vocabulary, and ideas of the Epistle to the Colossians in comparison with the acknowledged Epistles of Paul and with other literature, and reaches the conclusion that there is more that points to Pauline authorship than against it. A similar examination of the Epistle to the Ephesians leads to a similar conclusion, that on balance probability points to a Pauline origin, and that correspondences with post-Pauline literature are less manifest than with Pauline. There follows a study of the relations of these two Epistles to one another, in the course of which more than a score of passages in the one Epistle are compared with passages in the other, and the conclusion reached that while some things would seem to suggest different authors for the two Epistles, probability is in favour of community of authorship and of the genuineness of both Epistles. Short chapters on the destination of the Epistle to the Ephesians and the place of origin of both Epistles bring the work to a close. Here the Cæsarean hypothesis and the Ephesian hypothesis are examined and rejected, and the traditional view that they were written in Rome finally held to be probable. The conclusions throughout are therefore conservative, but to their support much learning is brought. It will be noted that the author does not find the evidence compelling, and at no point claims more than a high degree of probability for his findings.

H. H. Rowley.

Manchester.

---

[1] Vol. III. Parts 3, 4, and 5 [May–Oct., 1947]. Fr. Reinhardt, Basel.

[2] *Den Arabiske Bog* [1946]. Fischer, Copenhagen.

[3] *A Korán: Szemelvényekben* [1947]. Officina Nyomda és Kiadóvállalat Kft, Budapest.

[4] See The Expository Times, lviii. [May, 1947], 221.

[5] *Die Probleme der Kolosser-und Epheserbriefe* [1946]. Gleerup, Lund.

Entre Nous.

Alexander Stewart, Prisoner of Napoleon and Preacher of the Gospel.

Here is a book that Carlyle would have read with avidity. For it possesses what is so characteristic of his own style, and what delighted him in other writers, the power to make one feel that one is not merely reading the description of a man or the account of a happening, but is actually seeing them with one's very own eyes.

The Life of Alexander Stewart: Prisoner of Napoleon and Preacher of the Gospel (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net) is a remarkable story, all the more telling and effective by reason of the marked restraint and quietness with which it is set down.

Reared in a godly and happy home in Kirkcaldy, wiled away at the age of fourteen by the sudden suggestion of a companion, Stewart, with his conscience vehemently protesting against the pain he was causing his parents, made his way to Sunderland, and so to sea; was twice all but drowned in the first few weeks; and, his vessel being captured by a French privateer, chained to his fellow-unfortunates, was tramped right across France, on meagre rations, and at the rate of twenty-five miles a day, to be incarcerated, now here, now there, sometimes slightly better, sometimes worse, for ten long years.

In the unending dispute as to whether heredity or environment is the more dominant moulder of personality, Stewart seems a first-rate witness for heredity. At the time of his capture a mere child, penned all through his youth among wild and callous companions, with no man caring for his soul, or even for his body, with horrible hardships crowding in on him, with no trace or remembrance of religion in the atmosphere about him, surrounded by foul tongues and obscene minds, the lad ought, surely, to have grown up a savage barbarian. And yet, somehow, it was not so. Now and again, indeed, he pauses in his narrative to reproach himself, in a way that brings to his reader's mind that phrase of Scripture, 'hating even the garment spotted by the flesh.' But the boy's moral achievement was remarkable. He himself accounts for it quite simply. There is a persistent grace of God which keeps stubbornly following a man, and from which it is immensely difficult to escape. He, too, had found, like others long before him, that God makes His covenant, not with His servants only, but with their children and their children's children, with grace spilling over down the generations.

Apart from the sheer stark unbreakable courage of it all, as striking a feature as any in the narrative is the lad's passion for knowledge. That is said to be a characteristic of his countrymen. Stewart had it in full measure. A new prisoner happened to have an English grammar. He borrowed it, paying for the privilege, studied it with a kind of eager frenzy, so he says, copied it out verbatim, and counted it among his greatest treasures. Or, he taught himself French by paying for the right of studying the corrected exercises of one who could afford the tuition which he himself could not; and that so successfully that he became an expert, and in the last years of his imprisonment both at Arras and Angers was chosen as a kind of official secretary to the French Commanding Officer.

'Now the rest of his acts,' as the Book of Kings would put it, 'and all that he did,' his sufferings, his fights with bullies, his breathtaking, daring, bold escapes, his punishments, his marchings to and fro from one prison to another, and in the end his unchallenged flight to St. Malo and safe crossing to England at long last; his bitter disappointment at the indifference and lack of sympathy that met him there, his voyage to Russia, his dramatic home-coming to his mother's house in Kirkcaldy after eleven years of absence, his contest with Edward Irving, his schoolmastering in London, still teaching himself many things in unconventional ways, and reading hard, are they not written in the vivid Chronicle, penned, long years afterwards, by his own hand?

So, at least, up to 1815. Thereafter the story is abridged by Dr. Albert Peel, as skilfully as one expects in so expert an editor and writer.

But the most dramatic days are over, and the pace of things slackens. Stewart, still indomitably fighting his way to knowledge, became a Congregational minister in England, and put in a notable day's work. On to the end he remained a forceful and arresting character, clearing a space about him, fearing the face of no man, and finding adventure wherever he turned. One thinks of Newbolt's 'He did not come upon adventures; he was the cause of adventures; to meet him was itself an adventure.' So, with this man too.

The book is prefaced by a grandson, Sir P. Malcolm Stewart, Bart. 'It is said,' remarks the grandsire, 'that pride of ancestry is a sullen grace.' One is glad, sullen or not, that the descendant had enough of it to print this striking record. For, as Birrell says 'with thankfulness, and reverence,' after quoting the immortal passage in which Johnson recounts and faces his stroke, 'This is indeed tonic and bark for the mind.' This book, also, ought to shame us out of whining, and teach us how to meet life, at its darkest, unafraid.

A. J. Gossip.

Printed in Scotland by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

TWO REPRESENTATIVE TESTIMONIALS TO

'THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS'

'The *Encyclopædia* by its unprecedented comprehensiveness, its remarkable co-ordination of historical, philosophical and religious learning, and its patient grouping of comparative material, stands alone upon a very high eminence in the book world.

'To have it upon one's shelves is to be subjected to a continual temptation to stray far from one's immediate field into fascinating bypaths of study, and to be compelled in a thousand unexpected directions to enlarge one's outlook upon the wide province of religious experience and experiment and conviction.'

Rev. Principal W. A. CURTIS, D.D., D.Litt., D.Theol.

'I would emphasize just two points for the consideration of the working minister who wishes to be efficiently equipped for his responsible task as a preacher in these days.

'The first is this. In our time a minister who would win and keep the attention of thinking men must be furnished with knowledge far beyond what was requisite a generation ago, for popular knowledge has increased and questionings abound. In particular the study of religions has become of first-rate importance, and the preacher must have, not vague notions, but clear views of non-Christian faiths. So too, perhaps in less degree, with philosophies and speculations that are related by friendliness or hostility to Christian belief. If the minister have not such knowledge in his head, he must have ready access to it as occasion requires. Here in *The Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* lie all the necessary materials to hand ready for use. Further, the light here cast upon the Christian Verities is incalculable. Hundreds of texts are given deeper significance. Points, illustrations and enforcements are here for a lifetime's preaching, and, unlike some of the familiar and fallacious illustrations of our early days, those culled from this work may all be taken as absolutely trustworthy, guaranteed by the highest known authority.

'My second point is this. The *E.R.E.* is a whole library, and is the cheapest library one can secure. It gives the substance of many volumes that are scarce and costly. Of many single articles it is true that they make unnecessary the purchase of a shelf-ful of books. I would advise all theological students to devote their preaching fees to secure this splendid equipment for their life-task. To congregations that are thinking of giving their minister a really good present, I would suggest that they could give nothing so useful as a set of *E.R.E.*, if he is not fortunate enough to possess it already.'

Rev. Professor W. D. NIVEN, D.D., GLASGOW UNIVERSITY.

38 GEORGE STREET
EDINBURGH

T. & T. CLARK

'For a generation which has to face the problems of a world disposed to challenge all authority, and of a Church conscious of its inability to concentrate its forces for its world-wide task, the large outlook of these volumes is valuable beyond all telling.'—*Baptist Times*.

In Thirteen Handsome Volumes

THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS

Edited by Dr. JAMES HASTINGS

Vol. I.	**A—Art.**	**Vol. VII.**	**Hymns—Liberty.**
„ II.	**Arthur—Bunyan.**	**„ VIII.**	**Life—Mulla.**
„ III.	**Burial—Confessions.**	**„ IX.**	**Mundas—Phrygians.**
„ IV.	**Confirmation—Drama.**	**„ X.**	**Picts—Sacraments.**
„ V.	**Dravidians—Fichte.**	**„ XI.**	**Sacrifice—Sudra.**
„ VI.	**Fiction—Hyksos.**	**„ XII.**	**Suffering—Zwingli.**

INDEX VOL.—General Index.
Index of Foreign Words.
Index of Scripture Passages.
List of Authors, with their Contributions.

Price per Volume : In Half Leather - - - 70s. net.
In Cloth - - - - 45s. net.

The problems which at present confront the world cannot be solved by Twentieth-Century wisdom alone. Their roots were planted in the past. They are not new problems. They have confronted the people of former ages and can only be solved by applying the lessons learned by our forefathers.

The wisdom of the ages on all questions—ethical, social, religious, economic and political—is gathered together in this one great work. Here is represented what the great scholars of the world have been able to learn about all the nations as they developed or decayed, and of the nations now going through these processes.

This great work appeals to every man and woman who has any interest in the history of human progress, or in the present moral, spiritual and social well-being of mankind.

While it is the work of more than two hundred specialists, it is popular in form and non-technical in language. It is a library in itself. One eminent authority has said—'It contains in twelve admirably arranged volumes the substance of twelve hundred.'

'Any possessor of the Encyclopædia is armed at all points on every subject with which the theologian is concerned.'—*Christian World.*

'A remarkable achievement . . . the editorial work has been extraordinarily well done.'—*Guardian.*

'Has made itself an indispensable place in the apparatus of the student of any part of its wide field.'—*Harvard Theological Review.*

'The more the Encyclopædia is used, the more it is valued.'—*Hibbert Journal.*

'We have been repeatedly astonished and gratified by the completeness of the articles and the skill with which they are presented.'—*Times Literary Supplement.*

38 GEORGE STREET
EDINBURGH, 2

T. & T. CLARK

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
NEW YORK

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. *Registered for Transmission by Canadian Magazine Post.* *Entered as Second-Class Matter 15th March. 1929, at the Post Office, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.*

PUBLISHERS—T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH, 2. *Annual Subscription, including postage, 16s. 6d. net.*

AGENTS—WILLIAM DAWSON & SONS LTD., LONDON, E.C.4. CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

ADVERTISING DEPARTMENT—KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN. *Rates—£7, 7s. per page; smaller spaces pro rata. 'Copy' to be received not later than the 6th of the previous month.*